

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1400650

BX
9083
H5



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Edited by
The Rev. Prof. FRANCIS DAVIDSON, B.D.,
Paisley.



History and Doctrine of The United Original Secession Church of Scotland



Edinburgh :
W. F. Henderson, George IV. Bridge.

Glasgow :
John M'Callum & Co., 200-204 Buchanan Street.

Price One Shilling.

Expository Times
1st Review.

Via the editor's
compliments.

J. Davidson.

HISTORY AND DOCTRINE
OF
THE UNITED ORIGINAL
SECESSION CHURCH
OF SCOTLAND

Edited by
The Rev. Professor FRANCIS DAVIDSON, B.D.,
Paisley.

BX
9083
H5

HISTORY AND DOCTRINE
OF
THE UNITED ORIGINAL
SECESSION CHURCH
OF SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH:
W. F. HENDERSON, GEORGE IV. BRIDGE

GLASGOW:
JOHN McCALLUM & CO., 200-204 BUCHANAN ST.

EDITORIAL NOTE.

Amidst the ruins of the ancient palace of Assurbani-pal at Nineveh many thousands of tablets have been unearthed. Some of these were evidently the text-books for instruction in the old Akkadian and Sumerian languages. Such were called by the Assyrians: "Tablets to be with him." They were like a modern issue whose graceful motto is:

*"Everyman
I will go with thee
To be thy guide
In thy most need
To go by thy side."*

The simple purpose of this little book is to be with our young men and women in a much desired study of the history and doctrine of their own Church. It is felt that a knowledge of the noble origins and hardy developments of our Church is the surest way at once to loyalty and to catholicity of spirit. While primarily meant for Bible Classes, Study Circles, Guilds, and Young Communicants' Classes, it is hoped that the handbook may not be without service to many readers both within and without the Denomination. The great themes herein have been finely written by several of our representative ministers, and the whole booklet is issued with the supreme sanction of the United Original Secession Synod, May 1923. It is to be clearly understood that no credal value attaches, readers being referred to the fundamental Historical Testimony of July 1842.

Invaluable service has been rendered by Mr John Youngson, Edinburgh, in expert proof-reading and in suggesting many happy emendations of thought and style.

CONTENTS.

I. HISTORY.

PAGES

- A. BEFORE 1733 - - - 7-17
Rev. ALEXANDER PARKER, Pollok-
shaws.
- B. THE FIRST SECESSION OF 1733
TO 1842 - - - 19-33
Rev. JAMES YOUNG, Ayr.
- C. THE UNITED ORIGINAL
SECESSION CHURCH, 1842
TO 1923 - - - 35-50
Rev. THOS. E. ROBERTSON, B.D.,
Kirkcaldy.

II. DOCTRINE.

- A. GOD AND RELIGION - - 51-62
Rev. Professor ROBERT MORTON,
D.D., Glasgow.
- B. JESUS AND THE GOSPEL - 63-75
Rev. THOS. MATTHEW, Kilwinning.
- C. THE CHRISTIAN & HIS LIFE 77-88
Rev. EBENEZER A. DAVIDSON,
Edinburgh.

III. PRESENT POSITION.

- THE SECESSION CHURCH IN ITS
MODERN ENVIRONMENT - 89-94
Rev. Professor ROBERT MORTON,
D.D., Glasgow.

I. HISTORY.

A. Before 1733.

By the
Rev. ALEXANDER PARKER,
Pollokshaws.

A. The Reformation from Popery to Protestantism. 1560	PAGES 9-11
The fundamental principle.	
The Tulchan Bishops.	
The earliest national covenant.	
The Black Acts.	
B. The Reformation from Prelacy to Presby- terianism. 1638	11-14
Jenny Geddes.	
The Great Greyfriars National Covenant.	
Rev. Alexander Henderson.	
The Solemn League and Covenant.	
Cromwell's Commonwealth.	
C. The Restoration. 1660	14-15
Charles II. revokes Presbyterianism.	
The Drunken Parliament.	
The Covenanting Struggle during the reigns of Charles II. and James II. against both Prelacy and Popery.	
The first martyr—Argyle, 1661.	
The last martyr—Renwick, 1688.	
D. The Revolution. 1688	15-16
The defects of the Revolution Settlement.	
Its historic issues.	
The Cameronians or the Reformed Presbyterian Church.	
E. The Secession. 1733	16-17
Its Causes.	
Synod of Perth and Stirling.	
The Four Fathers suspended.	

BEFORE 1733.

A. The First Reformation.

THE absolute authority of the Bible was the fundamental principle of the Reformation. It was for this that John Knox and the Reformers earnestly contended. The Nation, the Church, and the Individual must yield to the Word implicit obedience. The contest, therefore, was waged between the supremacy of God's Word on the one side, and that of the Romish Church on the other. In Scotland the Reformation Principle went deeper than in England. The absolute authority of the Crown was what England, under Henry VIII. contended for. Henry had no desire to overturn the doctrines and ritual of the Church. What he insisted on was the right of Civil Government to function without outside interference of the Pope. In both countries the end was reached, but in Scotland the movement was a *popular one*, and essentially a *more religious one* than in England.

We cannot in the space allotted us enter into detail regarding the great work accomplished at the first Reformation. After faithful witness-bearing, much suffering and persecution, Protestantism replaced Popery in our beloved land. It was in Edinburgh in August, 1560, that Parliament abolished the Romish system, and set up Protestantism as the religion of Scotland. This upturn was so complete, that in a single year no one could have imagined that Romanism had ever existed in Scotland. The system established was puritan and scriptural in worship and democratic in Government. The teaching of the *New Testament Church* was its Pattern.

Queen Mary did all in her power to undermine the Reformation, and in vain tried to win Knox to her side. On the 24th July, 1567, the Queen abdicated in favour of her infant son, and thus the way was opened up for Parliament to ratify the Act, by which the nation passed formally from Popery to Protestantism.

At the death of Knox in 1572 the Church was not in a very satisfactory condition. The supply of Pastors was insufficient for the needs of the people, and consequently some ministers were appointed to large districts. These received the name of Superintendents. This name was given lest they should aspire to be Bishops in reality. It was the wish of Regent Morton to set apart certain ministers as Bishops, and he even secured a compromise whereby some who were unordained received the name of bishops, along with a very small share in the revenues, the larger share going into the pockets of the nobles. These were nicknamed *Tulchan Bishops*. Owing to Regent Morton's persistent attempts to convert these Tulchan Bishops into real Bishops, for years there was constant friction between Church and State

Andrew Melville, the successor of John Knox, proved that the name of Bishop belonged to every minister in the Church. Morton over-reached himself, and when James VI. ascended the throne in 1578 at the age of twelve it looked as if the troubles of the Church were ended. A deed drawn up by John Craig, the court Chaplain, was accepted and agreed to by the King. The deed was known as the *King's Confession*, and in later days with some additions as the *National Covenant*. It renounced Popery, and promised support to the Protestant faith, and was signed by the King and his household, and all ranks and classes in the land. This Covenant is epoch-making in the history of our nation, being the first Scottish National Covenant. The King was not to be trusted however, and Melville boldly defended the

rights of the Church against the encroachment of King and Civil Government, by presenting a remonstrance from the General Assembly to the King's Council. By guile the King gained one of his objects. He prevailed on the Assembly to appoint fourteen ministers to act as Commissioners for the Church, and then he got Parliament to bestow upon them the dignity of Bishops with seats in Parliament. Parliament passed what became known as the "Black Acts." These overturned the Authority of the Assembly, forbade it to meet without the consent of the King, ordained Bishops to supremacy in their sees, and placed absolute power in the hands of the King and the Council. Protests were all in vain, and in a short time the Church became Episcopal.

B. The Second Reformation.

The people received Charles I. with manifestations of great rejoicing, thinking that under him matters would be improved. Very soon their hopes were dashed to the ground. Instead of improving, things became worse. A spark for a mighty conflagration throughout the land was struck when *Jenny Geddes*, in *St Giles Church*, Edinburgh, threw her stool at the head of the Dean, who was using for the first time Laud's Service Book, which had been prepared for the Scottish Church, and which every minister was ordered to use. Everywhere risings against this manual took place. The people objected to ministers being compelled to read such prayers as those contained in the Service Book. This Book of Service was more distasteful than the liturgy of the English Church, and was looked upon as being no better than a Romish breviary. Petitions were presented calling for the withdrawal of the obnoxious production. So great was the ferment that, becoming alarmed, the Privy Council agreed to renew and enlarge the King's Confession

of 1581 protecting the liberties of the Scottish Church.

The National Covenant was signed on 28th February 1638. A large congregation assembled in *Greyfriars Church*, almost every part of the country being represented. Warriston read the Covenant after sermon, and the Earl of Loudon emphasised its importance and exhorted his hearers to be faithful to their bond and loyal to the Lord. God's blessing having been asked, the roll of parchment was spread on a tombstone for signature. Amid great emotion, the Earl of Sutherland was the first to subscribe. He was followed by the nobles, gentry, and common people. Some signatures, we are told, were written, not in ink, but in blood. Next day hundreds more subscribed, and copies of the bond were multiplied and scattered over the country and were subscribed by multitudes.

The King tried by compromise to divide the Covenanters, but failed. They were determined to have a free Assembly to attend to and settle the affairs of the Church. In the end of 1638 the first free Assembly, for forty years, met at Glasgow. The King's Commissioner protested in vain against the liberty of action claimed by the Church, and ordered the Assembly to dissolve. The Moderator, the *Rev. Alexander Henderson of Leuchars*, solemnly protested and declared that they could not dissolve. This Assembly condemned the Service Book, removed the Bishops and swept away their power and ceremonies, and restored Presbyterianism. Charles, in answer to this, sent an army into Scotland, but the Covenanters made such preparations to meet the army, that at Berwick a treaty was agreed to, allowing an Assembly to meet and a Parliament to ratify the proceedings. A second time the King prepared to invade Scotland, but he was again forestalled and defeated, and at Westminster in 1641 he yielded to the Covenanters and confirmed the Acts of the

Assembly and Parliament. By his treacherous conduct Charles forfeited the loyalty of Scotland.

In August 1643 Commissioners from the English Parliament sought the aid of Scotland, and suggested the formation of a bond between the three Kingdoms as a means of mutual preservation. At the meeting of Assembly in Edinburgh, Henderson moved that the bond should be religious as well as civil, and, this being agreed to, he drafted the *Solemn League and Covenant*. It was welcomed and approved by the Assembly, and latterly by the Westminster Assembly and the English Parliament. All the King's subjects were enjoined to subscribe, otherwise they would be looked upon as enemies of the Kingdoms. It was extensively signed in England and rapturously received in Scotland, and it was sealed in 1644 when the hopes of Charles were dashed at Marston Muir.

The design of the Solemn League and Covenant was to secure the ascendancy of Presbyterianism, to promote *uniformity of religion in the three Kingdoms*, to preserve the freedom of Parliament and the liberties of the people, to defend the King in maintaining the Reformed religion, to protect mutually those within the bonds of the Covenant, and to set before the world a worthy example of virtue and Godliness in every sphere of life. As a result of the League, Presbyterianism reigned for a short period in England, Ireland and Scotland. In December 1647 the King intimated that he was willing to confirm the Solemn League and Covenant by Act of Parliament on certain conditions, but by the crushing defeat at Preston, Cromwell ended the matter.

A week after the execution of Charles I. the Scottish Parliament proclaimed his son King. Charles II. unwillingly yielded to the conditions of Assembly and Parliament and subscribed the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant on 23rd June 1650. When crowned at Scone, he, a second time, subscribed the two

Covenants. The success of Cromwell compelled Charles to flee from Scotland. England during the period of Cromwell's supremacy treated Scotland practically as a conquered country. Ten years after the Solemn League and Covenant had been signed, Cromwell forcibly dissolved the Assembly, and the Covenant was no longer enforced, and so as to the worship of God every man did as he pleased.

C. The Restoration.

When the Protector died, English Presbyterians and a section of the Covenanters united their forces with the Royalists and invited Charles to return from exile. Exactly a century had elapsed since the official recognition of the Reformation in Scotland, when Charles II. set foot once more on British soil, and received an enthusiastic welcome. He held the same old views and was determined to brook no opposition. He seemed to have no religious faith, and as a consequence he persecuted those who were religious.

The people of Scotland were unshaken in their attachment to their *Presbyterian faith*. Owing to disunion in the Church—but for which perhaps Charles might never have been recalled—and to the indifference of the upper classes, the King through his representatives was able to do as he pleased.

One of the blackest days in the history of our country was the 1st January 1661 when the first Parliament to meet for nine years assembled in Edinburgh. This Parliament became known as *Middleton's Drunken Parliament*. Middleton, a soldier of fortune, also a renegade Covenanter, was the King's Commissioner. He and the men of public affairs were notorious debauchees. In a few months time this Parliament passed nearly 400 Acts. We mention two of the Acts, which were of far-reaching importance and were the cause

of years of untold suffering and misery in our beloved country. There was the *Oath of Allegiance*, preceded by the Act of Supremacy, which made the King supreme in all affairs of Church and State. According to the Oath of Allegiance, the lieges had to acknowledge the supremacy of the King in all things civil and religious. The *Act Recissory* was also passed by which the National Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant were declared to be unlawful oaths, and no longer binding; the General Assembly held at Glasgow in 1638 was pronounced illegal and treasonable, and all Acts and deeds passed and done in recent Parliaments were repealed.

This was the beginning of a long period of persecution in Scotland. In the *Covenanting struggle* we have an outstanding instance of the persistent resistance of principle to power. In spite of bloody persecution and brutal oppression, the Covenanters held tenaciously to their principles. Between the execution of Argyle the first martyr and James Renwick the last one, it is computed that about 18,000 were murdered and destroyed.

D. The Revolution.

On the 30th June 1688, a few leading politicians formally invited *William, Prince of Orange*, to intervene and deliver Britain from the Popish tyranny of King James. He responded to the appeal. On 5th November he landed with an army. James was left in the lurch by his friends and had to flee the country. In Scotland an appeal was made to stand by the King. This appeal was received by cheers for the Deliverer. The people demanded a free Parliament; they burned the Pope in effigy; they stormed Holyrood Palace; and from the Chapel they removed all the Romish Symbols, Crucifixes, images and books of which they made a bonfire in the High Street.

The Revolution of 1688 was one of the most peaceful that any nation ever experienced. In many ways Scotland was ripe for it. William allowed the Scots to settle their Church Government for themselves. The Scottish Estates met in March 1689 and adopted the Claim of right, and afterwards Parliament rescinded the Act of Supremacy. Liberty of conscience was secured. *Presbyterianism was settled as the Government of Christ's Church within the Nation.* The ousted ministers received free access to their Churches. After an interval of 37 years the General Assembly of the Church met once more on the 16th October 1690. The ministers numbered 90.

At the best the Revolution settlement was a compromise, and schemes of expediency often lead to evils. The subsequent misfortunes and failures of the Scottish Church can be directly traced to the defects in that Settlement. For instance the old law of Patronage was abolished, but the system substituted was an unhappy one. The reversion to the extreme form of Patronage in 1712, followed by forced settlements of ministers upon parishes, led directly or indirectly to the Secession in 1733, the Relief in 1761 and the Disruption in 1843.

Owing to the defects in the *Revolution Settlement*, especially its failure to occupy the whole position of the Covenanters, a minority refused to acknowledge the Church set up, and claimed to be the true Reformed Church of Scotland. These were called after their leader Cameronians, and are known as the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

E. The Secession of 1733.

Very soon after the setting up of the Reformed Church in 1690, evils within the Church began to manifest themselves. Unnecessary or sinful oaths and tests were imposed, and an *Act of Toleration* in favour of Episcopalian clergy was introduced,

Patronage was also restored. A spirit of *Moderatism* within the Church produced unsoundness in doctrine and unfaithfulness within the Church Courts. The Government of the Church was also oppressive in its administration. The Assembly used despotic measures to suppress any opposition to their sinful courses. In October 1732, *Rev. Ebenezer Erskine* in his sermon at the opening of the Synod of Perth and Stirling took the opportunity of testifying against the leading defections of the Church, and in particular referred to the Act of the preceding Assembly anent the planting of vacant Churches. He was sentenced by the Synod to be admonished and rebuked. He protested and appealed to the Assembly. At its meeting in the following May, the Assembly upheld the decision of the Synod. Mr Erskine protested and asserted his right "to preach the same truths, and to testify against the same or like defections upon proper occasions." Messrs *Alexander Moncrieff* of Abernethy, *William Wilson* of Perth, and *James Fisher* of Kinclaven, adhered to Mr Erskine's protest. In August they were suspended by a Commission of Assembly, and in November they were declared to be no longer ministers of the Church.

On the 6th December, 1733, these four ministers formed themselves into a Presbytery, known as the *Associate Presbytery*. Their names have ever remained precious. They were men of long vision, and anticipated by fully 100 years the Disruption of 1843. As their lineal decendants, we believe they occupied higher ground than that on which the Disruption principle rested. They took up a stand on behalf of democratic government within the Church, and they raised a standard for the Covenanted Reformation and purity of doctrine and worship.

I. HISTORY.

B. The First Secession of 1733 to 1842.

By the
Rev. JAMES YOUNG,
Ayr.

	PAGES
A. The Beginning. 1733 - - -	21
Gairney Bridge.	
Associate Presbytery.	
Rapid Growth of the Secession.	
B. The Breach. 1747 - - -	21-23
Secession Pledge to Return to Estab- lished Church.	
Burgess Oath.	
Split into Burghers and Anti-Burghers.	
Associate or Burgher Synod.	
General Associate or Anti-Burgher Synod.	
C. The Old and the New Lights. 1799:1806	23-26
Confession of Faith and Religious Power of Civil Magistrate.	
Burgher Split. 1799.	
{ New Light Associate Burgher Synod.	
{ Old Light Original Burgher Synod.	
Anti-Burgher Split. 1806.	
{ New Light General Associate Synod.	
{ Old Light Constitutional Associate Presbytery.	
D. The First Reunion. 1820 - - -	26-28
Burgher and Anti-Burgher New Lights unite and form United Secession Church.	
E. The Second Reunion. 1827 - - -	28-29
Synod of Protestors against 1820 basis of union and Old Light Constitu- tional Associate Presbytery unite and form Original Secession Church.	
F. The Third Reunion. 1842 - - -	29-33
Minority of Old Light Original Burgher Synod and Original Secession Church unite and form United Original Secession Church.	

THE FIRST SECESSION OF 1733 to 1842

A.—The Beginning.

WHEN the four brethren were thrust out of the Church of Scotland by an Act of Assembly, they proceeded to set up a *modus vivendi*. By arrangement they met together for Conference at Gairney-bridge, a little hamlet in Kinross shire. Before making any resolution, or deciding upon any course of action, they gave themselves to prayer. For the greater part of two days they waited reverently on God, and in the afternoon of the 6th December, 1733, they came to an unanimous resolution to constitute themselves as a Presbytery, giving it the distinctive name, the *Associate Presbytery*. This action on their part was the origin of a movement which rapidly spread. Soon the Seceders were joined by other ministers who sympathised with them, and wished to stand where they stood; and their ministrations were so popular that by the year 1744, there were no fewer than thirty regularly organised congregations in different parts of the country, besides a number of vacancies for which as yet they had no pastors. In these circumstances they deemed it expedient to form a Synod with the three Presbyteries of Dunfermline, Glasgow, and Edinburgh. This they did, and called it the *Associate Synod*.

B.—The Breach.

When the prevailing party in the Church of Scotland saw the Secession movement spreading

out over an ever increasing area, they realised that they had blundered. To undo the mischief they had done, and to bring the Secession to an end, they made tempting offers to the ejected ministers to induce them to return, but without effect. The seceding brethren were persuaded that there was no sincerity behind the conciliatory offers, and consequently they would not yield to the blandishments of the Moderates. They were pledged, or rather, had pledged themselves to return to the first free, faithful, and reforming General Assembly, but they knew that these conditions did not exist. The attempt, therefore, to sow dissention among the brethren and to divide them was foiled. But when the Secession Church had run its prosperous way for twelve years, a real apple of discord appeared, and caused unhappy results. This was the Controversy over the *Burgess Oath*. The nature of the dispute may be briefly stated. Persons who became Burgesses in the cities of Glasgow, Perth, and Edinburgh were required to take the Burgess Oath which contained this phrase :—"I profess and allow with my heart the true religion professed within this realm, and authorised by the laws thereof." It was round this religious clause that the disastrous controversy raged. What did it mean? Did it carry with it an approval of the existing Establishment with all its doctrinal errors and violations of Constitution; or did it simply bind the person taking the Oath to an approval of the true religion without committing him to an approval of the particular manner in which it was professed in Scotland? The debating of that alternative was carried on for two years, not without heat. One party held that it was allowable to take the Oath; the other party held that it was sin. No agreement could be reached. Healing overtures were introduced only to be brushed aside. The debates were always keen, and sometimes furious. At length, in 1746 the Synod divided, and the vote was in favour of the party

which was opposed to the taking of the Oath. In the following year, however, the tables were turned. *Ebenezer Erskine* proposed that the Synod, without reversing its decision, should remit the matter to Pre-byteries and Sessions, and by a majority this motion was carried. When this decision was declared, twenty-three members of Synod, led by *Alexander Moncrieff* and *Adam Gib*, protested and withdrew. In April 1747 they constituted themselves into a Church Court and proceeded to deal with the majority according to Church forms. This decision, which made its way into every hamlet where the Secession had established itself, and created an absolute cleavage, was called *The Breach*. There were now two ecclesiastical bodies in Scotland at one in all matters of doctrine discipline and government, at one in everything except the interpretation of the religious clause in the Burgess Oath. Both for a time claimed to be the Associate Synod, but from 1788 the minority who protested against the decision concerning the Oath, called their Supreme Court, the *General Associate Synod*. The popular way of naming the two sections is expressive. The majority were called Burghers and the minority were called Anti-Burghers.

C.—The Old Light and the New.

At the close of the eighteenth century a controversy was raised in each of the Secession Synods which led to division again as deplorable as the "Breach." The subject of discussion was concerning the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion. The debate assumed the form of a wedge, and it cleft the Burgher or Associate Synod into two parts. The position taken up by the one side was that, while not condemning the Confession of Faith as countenancing intolerant and persecuting tenets, and not even professing to determine the

meaning of the standards in controverted topics, they recognised the conscientious scruples of those who had definite convictions on the subject, and sought to give them constitutional relief by means of what they called the *Preamble*: that was what we might call a Declaratory Act. It was to be read before the questions of the Formula were put to ministers and probationers and elders, as showing what the Synod meant when it required adherence to the whole doctrine contained in the Confession of Faith. The attempt to overthrow this finding failed, and two ministers and two elders, who strenuously opposed all change, whether of Confession or Formula, tabled a protest repudiating the jurisdiction of the Court till they returned to their principles. A month later the two protesting ministers were joined by another, and they constituted themselves an independent Court called the *Associate Presbytery*, and when their number increased they formed themselves into a Synod. These are commonly called the *Old Lights*, while the majority from whom they separated have been styled the *New Lights*.

It was the same wedge that split the Anti-Burgher Synod also. The controversy in this case arose out of two overtures that found their way to the General Synod of 1791. There was the Glasgow Overture calling attention to the Confession and its seeming sanction of interference by the civil magistrate in matters of religion, and there was the Forfar Overture calling for the simplification of the Testimony. The latter overture was given precedence; a Committee was appointed to draft an Act for the extending, in the first instance, of the Secession Testimony, and to report to next Synod. Before the Committee had time to act, another question was raised requiring settlement. Students were appearing before their Presbyteries for licence who made the statement that in answering in the affirmative the questions of the Formula they were not to be understood as giving any judgment upon

the questions respecting the power of the civil magistrate in religious matters, in so far as the same is in dependence before the General Associate Synod. The Supreme Court to which the matter was referred granted what was sought, and passed a Declaratory Act for the purpose of doing something, as it affirmed, to obviate the scruples which young men at licence, preachers and elders at ordination, private persons at their accession and at the baptism of their children, have offered to the Court about *the doctrine or manner of expression used respecting the power of the civil magistrate in matters of religion in the Confession of Faith.*

This question disposed of, the Synod set itself to the task of extending the Testimony. In October 1796 the draft of the Committee was presented, and with it came the apple of discord again. Protracted sederunts were spent in considering the draft of the new document. Year after year the controversy went on with unabated force, and not until 1804 was final judgment given. In the May of that year the Synod adopted as "the term of admission for those who shall apply for joining in Communion, what is known as the *Narrative and Testimony*, with the limitation stated in the Introduction, to be acted upon after the people have had due time to acquaint themselves with these deeds." When this decision was come to, five ministers intimated their protest and reserved liberty to make further opposition as they might judge necessary. A year was spent in further protesting and remonstrating on one side and the answering of protests and remonstrances on the other side. At length came the division. On the 28th August 1806, while the General Synod was holding its annual meeting in Glasgow, the protesting brethren met at Whitburn, and constituted themselves as a Presbytery. To this Court they shortly afterwards gave the name of the *Constitutional Associate Presbytery*, intending by the term "Constitutional" to express their adherence to the constitution of

the Reformed Church of Scotland, and to that of the Associate Presbytery and Synod. Thus the General Associate Presbytery of Anti-Burghers was split into two parties, the greater being called the "New Lights" and the minority the "Auld Lights."

D.—The Repairing of the Breach: The First Reunion.

The Breach of 1747 was a great disaster. The matter in dispute was no ground of separation. Neither doctrine nor principle was involved. It was simply a question regarding the interpretation of a particular clause in the Burgess Oath of three cities in Scotland, an oath which none of the ministers and comparatively few of the members of the Secession were required to take. It was a question for forbearance, sweet reasonableness: it is a pity that this inestimable grace was a late fruit in the Secession soil. Happily, however, with the passage of time and with the advent of a new century, the desire for getting together again became a growing aspiration. The *New Light Burghers* and the *New Light Anti-Burghers*, or "Voluntaries" as they may now be called, had largely forgotten the old controversy about the Oath; it had no interest for them. Instead of standing aloof from each other they began to mingle and co-operate in public and religious movements. They were one in the common cause, and the question came to be, "Why should they not become one in ecclesiastical bonds?" Having one creed, one constitution, one history and heritage the feeling was that they ought to be one by an incorporating union. So they thought and argued. As the result of their cogitations, a movement towards each other was made in 1818. It is not necessary to narrate the steps that were taken, or how the Ecclesiastical machinery was set agoing. Sufficient to say, when the Supreme Courts of Scottish Seceders met in the Spring of 1819, it

was abundantly evident that the stream of tendency in favour of incorporation was both wide and deep. On the clerk's table of the Associate or Burghers Synod eighty-eight petitions from congregations throughout the land were laid, calling for the opening of negotiations with the General Associate or Anti-Burgher Synod, while documents of a similar character to the number of seventy-four were lodged with the officials of that body. The way was thus made clear and inviting for both Churches to appoint certain of their number to co-operate in preparing a scheme of agreement, and they worked so harmoniously in joint-meetings that by the summer of 1820, a *Basis of Union* consisting of six articles was ready for the acceptance of the two Synods in the Autumn of the same year. On the fifth of September these two Synods, with a view to ending co-operation and to achieve incorporation, convened at Edinburgh in separate places of worship for the last time. On the eighth, each court having been constituted, the members set out in two bands, their respective Moderators at their head, probationers and students bringing up the rear. The two companies concentrated upon Bristo Street Church, where 73 years before the Breach had taken place. The Moderators took part in the opening proceedings in the order of seniority, each calling upon the clerk of his own Synod to read the last minute of the separate body. The documents were expressed in the same terms, and each recorded the resolution to repair to the appointed place that they may unite with their brethren of the other Synod to be known by the name of the *United Associate Synod of the Secession Church*. The articles forming the Basis of Union were then read by the Clerks while the members stood. This was followed by a formal declaration of union on the part of the Moderators and their giving to each other the right hand of fellowship; the ministers and elders

joining in the expression of brotherhood and fellowship. Thus was consummated the first union between the two branches of the Secession Church, the precursor of others to follow.

E.—The Second Reunion.

In the great union of the Burgher and Anti-Burgher Synods, the former went in a solid body into the Union Church; there was not a single dissentient; not a "hoof" was left behind. It was not so with the latter. Even while the union negotiations were drawing near to a favourable termination, it became apparent that entire unanimity in the Anti-Burgher Committee was not to be attained. *Dr Paxton* and *Dr Stevenson* being unable conscientiously to agree to the proposed union, the latter drew up a declaration and protest to which several other ministers adhered. This protesting minority refrained from any action of separation until after the union had taken place, in the hope that the United Church would issue a Testimony, satisfactory to all parties. But when it became evident that no immediate action in that direction would be taken the Protesters felt constrained to sever connection and constitute themselves as a separate body. This was done at Edinburgh in May 1821, when seven ministers and five elders met to reserve the exercise of their judicial powers in a way suited to their reduced circumstances as to numbers, and constituted themselves as a Court in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Subsequently others acceded to the Protestors who retained the name of the Associate Synod, formerly called Anti-Burghers; but whom, for the sake of clearness we call the *Synod of Protestors*.

The existence of this slender offshoot in a separate state was of brief duration. On the 13th May, 1824, the Synod appointed a Committee to enter into negotiation with the *Constitutional Presbytery*

with a view to union. Their friendly approach met with a favourable reception, and the practical step was taken of appointing a Committee of five to meet with any similar body the Protestors should appoint. This resulted in the formation of a joint Committee, the meetings of which extended over nearly three years, and which ultimately laid before the negotiating bodies an overture containing explanatory and assertory articles, and also a Testimony in which the two Courts might unite. The Secession manifesto consists of two parts, one historical and the other doctrinal. The Constitutional Presbytery was responsible for the first part, and it was entirely the production of *Dr M'Crie of Edinburgh*. The Synod of Protestors undertook to prepare the doctrinal division, and it was *Dr Stevenson of Ayr* who mainly did the work. By May, 1827, all the preliminaries had been satisfactorily adjusted, and on the 17th of that month, the two Secession Sections met in what was at that date the Meeting House, Infirmary Street, Edinburgh; and became one body under the name of the *Associate Synod of Original Seceders* a designation intended to denote that they stood on the same platform, historically and doctrinally as that occupied by the first Seceders in 1733.

F.—The Third Reunion.

With the union of the New Light Burghers, and the New Light Anti Burghers in 1820, and the union of the Constitutionals and the Protestors who represented the Old Light Anti-Burghers in 1827, we have still to account for the *Old Light Burghers' Synod*. What became of it? After twenty years of separate existence, during which Union was in the air, the desire was awakened in it for amalgamation with some other Church. It was natural that the first movement should be in the direction of the Old Light Anti-Burghers. These two Old Light bodies engaged in the search for a

common platform for upwards of fifteen years, but all to no purpose. That old bone of contention, the Burgess Oath, though abolished in 1819 still blocked the way. The Burghers were willing to concede everything short of pronouncing it sinful to take the Oath. But *Dr Paxton*, the redoubtable leader of the Anti-Burghers was stern and uncompromising. There was little of the New Testament grace of *ἐπιεικεια* in him. He had pertinacity but no yieldingness. Unless the Burghers said that it was "sinful," the Anti-Burgher would have nothing to do with them; he could never extend to them the right hand of fellowship. That ultimatum ended their negotiations.

After receiving this rebuff the Burghers turned their eyes elsewhere, and this time it was towards the Established Church that they looked. Perhaps, with the waning of the Moderate Party, and the ascendancy of the Evangelical Party in the Assembly, *they thought that the time for which the Seceders were waiting had come, and that they should return to the bosom of the Mother-Church.* Be that as it may, a letter was sent to the Moderator of the General Assembly, expressing the favourable feeling which prevailed in the body towards the Church of Scotland; its decided attachment to the cause of National Establishment, and its desire to return to its communion. The letter had a favourable reception, and as a result a Committee was appointed to meet with a Committee of the Synod. We need not go into all the details of these negotiations, we need only say that the Overture in favour of reunion with the Seceders received the approval of a majority of Presbyteries, and in the Assembly *Dr Candlish* moved the passing of the Union Overture into an Act. In the course of his speech on that occasion, he characterised with his wonted foresight of vision and felicity of expression, the prospective return of the Secession Synod as the beginning of that ingathering by which the Church of Scotland might yet be the Church of all the people in the

land. The Deliverance of the Assembly was in these terms—"The General Assembly, with the consent of the Presbyteries of the Church, enact and ordain that all the ministers of the Associate Synod and their congregations in Scotland desirous of being admitted into connection and full communion with the Church of Scotland be received accordingly." This action of the Establishment in May afforded the Old Light Burghers their desired ground of a consistent accession. When the Synod met in July, a series of seven resolutions were passed, in one of which it was agreed to empower the Moderator at the close of the final sederunt to declare that the Synod and component Presbyteries ceased to exist from, and after that date, and to instruct ministers and elders to unite themselves as early as may be practicable, to the Presbyteries of the National Church in their respective bounds. Was there ever a Church Union effected in this tame and simple fashion? There was no walking in procession to the Assembly Hall; there was no receiving of the right hand of fellowship from the Moderator; there was no dramatic moment, no spectacular effects; there was no ceremonial of any kind. The Synod simply dissolved in 31st July, 1839, and the next time the members appeared in Church Courts, it was in those of the Establishment within the bounds of which their congregations were situated. Thus was consummated *the first Union betwixt the Church of Scotland and a section of the Seceders* who, about a century before had separated from her.

But the Burgher Synod did not go solidly into the Establishment. To be in the fashion there was a *minority* which held back. These, however, were treated in a brotherly way. In the Union motion that was carried there appeared a clause to the effect that the records of the Church Court be left in the hands of the minority on the understanding that the majority have access to them at any time if it should be necessary, and the minority

reciprocated the friendliness by intimating that when the resolutions were adopted by the Synod no protest would be taken by them ; the separation would be amicable on their part, and they would adopt measures for conducting the public cause of the Associate body as heretofore. The result was that of forty-one ministers of the Synod in Scotland, thirty-one acceded to the Church of Scotland, one joined the United Secession Church, and one the Reformed Presbyterian Church, whilst the others retained their standing as the *Original Burgher Synod*. The separate existence of this little body was short. For but three years they stood alone, but before that time had expired they were holding communication in the interests of an incorporating Union with the Original Secession Synod, with whom they had been in fruitless negotiation for union some eight years previously. On this occasion the Burgess Oath did not block the way. Their desire for union was cordially reciprocated by the Original Secession Synod, and in 1841 a Basis of Union was formulated, and on *the 18th of May 1842 the Union was consummated* in what was in those days Davie Street Church, Edinburgh, what is now M'Crie Roxburgh Church, of which the elder Dr M'Crie had been minister, and of which at the time of Union the younger Dr M'Crie was the Original Secession pastor. The only regret in connection with this Union was that two ministers of the Original Secession Synod dissented from the proposed Union, and at the time of the Union left the Synod, declined its authority, constituting themselves into a separate Presbytery. Within ten years they separated from each other, and spent the remainder of their days solitary and alone.

The only difference of nomenclature to which the Union of 1842 gave rise was the prefixing of the term "United" to the name of the body with which the minority of the Old Light Burghers cast in their lot. Subsequently to 1842 and up to the present day it has passed under the name of the

Synod of United Original Seceders. As has been already indicated, the difficulty as to the original ground of separation between the two parties was taken out of the way in 1819, and all that was done in that matter was the formulating in the Articles of Agreement of some abstract proposition to which Burghers and Anti-Burghers alike could give their adherence. The distinctive feature in the incorporating agreement was the resolution concerning *Covenanting*. The resolution was thus stated:—"That the renewing of our Covenants, in a bond suited to the times, is a seasonable duty, and that means shall be used for having that solemn exercise performed throughout the united body." Accordingly, and in order to give publicity and prominence to their views on the seasonableness of *Covenanting*, the negotiating Synods resolved to consummate the movement by a Synodical *Covenanting* in which ministers and probationers and students of Divinity would take part. Their resolution was given effect to on the 19th May 1842.

It is interesting to note that in 1842, more than a hundred years since the Secession began, the Seceders are to be found in two ecclesiastical divisions. The New Lights Burgher and Anti-Burgher are to be found in the *United Secession Church*; and the Old Lights—in popular parlance, the Auld Lights—consisting of the Constitutionalists, Protestors, and Old Light Burghers, are to be found in the *United Original Secession Church*.

I. HISTORY.

C. The United Original Secession Church, 1842-1923

By the

**Rev. THOMAS E. ROBERTSON, B.D.,
Kirkcaldy.**

	PAGES
A. Story of the Split in 1852 - - -	37-43
Its causes in the 1843 Disruption.	
Communications with the Free Church.	
The consequent controversy within the Secession Synod.	
The Question at issue—the continued obligation of the Covenants.	
Obstacles to union with the Free Church stated.	
The protesting party meet as the con- stitutional Synod of the United Original Secession Church in April 1852 at Mains Street, Glasgow.	
B. Reconstruction of the Church after the Split of 1852 - - -	43-48
(1) The Divinity Hall.	
(2) The Magazine.	
(3) The Renewal of the Covenants.	
(4) The Fraternal Union with the Irish Secession Synod, 1873.	
(5) The Home Mission.	
(6) The Foreign Mission.	
C. Other activities in the interests of the Kingdom of God - - -	48-50
Watchful attitude amidst changing tendencies.	
The gracious life and work of the Rev. Alex. Smellie, M.A., D.D.	
Brotherly relations with the Reformed Presbyterian Church.	

THE UNITED ORIGINAL SECESSION CHURCH, 1842-1923.

FOR the United Original Secession Church, the years immediately following the Union of 1842 were by no means happy. Hopes of future growth and harmony were not to be fulfilled. In 1852 ere ten years had been completed, the Church was unhappily divided. Only half of those who had joined in the Union of 1842 continued to adhere to the position which had then been adopted. The others cast in their lot with the Free Church of Scotland, and ceased to maintain a distinctive position.

A.—Story of the Split in 1852.

This unfortunate division was the result of external rather than of internal causes. It was an after effect of the great "Disruption," which rent the Church of Scotland in 1843, and resulted in the formation of the Free Church. The Seceders could not but hail the "1843 Disruption" as an event of good omen. It meant that others had been led to adopt their attitude toward the evils and abuses of patronage. On 4th May 1843 the Secession Synod, prior to the Disruption of the Church of Scotland, passed a resolution encouraging the Evangelical party in the Establishment to persevere in their opposition to the State's encroachments upon the liberty of the Church. A deputation of five members was appointed to present this Resolution to the first Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland in the event of a Disruption taking place. In a few days the Disruption did occur, and at the first meeting of the Free Church General Assembly,

when deputies from many quarters appeared, the representatives of the Original Secession Church appeared also, and submitted the resolution of their Synod. Replying to the Deputies, *Dr Guthrie* expressed appreciation of their sympathy and encouragement. In reference to the attitude of the Free Church, he also said—"We have testified for the Crown (of Christ), and there was to-night a gentle insinuation that we had not testified for the Covenant. Let them bide their time. If the work goes on we may go farther than we have done. The breeze has unfurled our banner far enough to enable us to read the Crown upon it; if that breeze swell into a hurricane, then, Sir, it will unfurl our flag so much the farther that the world will see upon that wide-spread banner both the Covenant and the Crown." The year following, a return deputation was sent to the Original Secession Synod from the Free Church, and negotiations were initiated with a view to Union. Strong hopes were entertained by the Original Seceders that the Free Church, which had taken her stand on the comparatively low level of the *Revolution Settlement* would be led to adopt the higher platform of the *Second Reformation* period (1638-50.) These hopes were encouraged by later events. There were signs of a movement in the Free Church in favour of a "historical testimony in regard to the former contendings of the Church of Scotland, and her efforts to promote a Covenanted Reformation." An overture to this effect was supported by *Dr Candlish* in the Free Church Assembly, but objections being raised in some quarters, the matter was remitted to a Committee for further consideration. When their report was called for by the Assembly in 1848 the Convener, *Dr Cunningham*, reported that he had none to give, and suggested that the Committee for conferring with the Original Seceders should be discharged. This was accordingly done. It was a decision which grievously disappointed the advocates of union.

amongst the Original Seceders, and the Rev. Wm. White, Editor of the *Original Secession Magazine* * wrote a powerful article opposing union with the Free Church unless her attitude should be changed. The standpoint of this article represented the feeling of the great majority of Seceders at the time. The position however was somewhat altered when a meeting of the Free Church General Assembly in May 1851, adopted an Act and Declaration to be prefixed to a volume containing the Westminster Standards, and other official documents of the Free Church. This Act and Declaration corresponded very much to what Dr Candlish had proposed in 1847. It was modified however to meet the objections that had led to his proposal being withdrawn. It endeavours to prove the identity of the Free Church with the historic Church of Scotland during the Reformation period. It recalls with approval several occasions on which our reforming ancestors bound themselves by solemn Covenant bonds. Its closing words express the resolve of the Free Church to prosecute the ends contemplated from the beginning in all the acts and deeds of her reforming fathers until the true system which they upheld should be universally received. Gratifying, so far as it went, to all Scottish ecclesiastical patriots, this Declaration contained nothing committing the Free Church to any position, positive or negative, regarding the continued or descending obligation of Covenants. There is an entire absence of any recognition of such obligation. This, evidently studied, silence was naturally regarded by many among the Original Seceders as unsatisfactory. There were those on the other hand who were ready to see in this Declaration a sign that there was no longer any valid obstacle to Union with the Free Church.

* The *Magazine* first appeared in January 1847. The Rev. William White was editor from the beginning, and continued until the Breach in 1852, when this series of the *Magazine* terminated.

Amongst them was the Rev. William White. He now supported the movement which hitherto he had condemned, and in the pages of the *Magazine* published several editorials strongly in favour of Union. Meanwhile, able pamphlets were produced by those who took a contrary view of the situation. The foremost among these were Dr Murray and Dr Manson. Two elders also took a prominent part in the controversy, Mr William M'Crie of Edinburgh, urging, and Mr George Jack of Dundee, opposing the suggested Union. The controversy was brief, but it was hot and vehement. Feeling ran high, and it was considered advisable to hold an informal meeting of Synod. At this Conference it became clear that when the Synod should meet in order to come to a final decision the voting would be close and keen. *The chief question at issue was whether or not the principle of the continued obligation of the National Covenants on posterity should be regarded by Seceders as a fundamental article of Union.* The minority considered that it should be so regarded, since it had been for many years reckoned a term of ministerial and Christian Communion in the Secession, and since a recognition of it had formed an element in the union of the Constitutionalists and Protesters in 1827, and in the union of the Anti-Burgher and Burgher Synods in 1842. The majority, while they likewise believed in the continued obligation of the National Covenants, did not consider that the recognition of this principle should necessarily be insisted on as a term of ministerial and Christian fellowship.

There was thus a difference of opinion that could not well be bridged over, and at the Synod meetings held in April 1852 in East Campbell Street Church, Glasgow, the inevitable rupture took place. An overture proposing Union was submitted, supported by *Dr M'Crie*. It pointed out that the Seceders had all along claimed to hold the principles of the old Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland, and maintained also that the Free Church had now

taken up those principles, and that therefore it was incumbent upon the Seceders to seek admission to her fellowship. When this had been moved by Dr M'Crie and seconded, the *Rev. James Anderson* of Carlisle immediately submitted a series of resolutions embodying principles which stood in the way of the adoption of the overture. The chief of these were to the effect

- (1) That no church is warranted, even for the laudable object of Union, "to relinquish any of her Scriptural principles and attainments in the way of dropping these from her public profession":
- (2) That both sections of the Original Secession had throughout their history claimed to be a branch of the Reformed and Covenanted Church of Scotland, witnessing in a state of Secession for her Reformation principles; more particularly they professed adherence to the whole of the Westminster Standards as subordinate standards of doctrine, worship and government, and as parts of the covenanted uniformity for the churches in the three kingdoms, as well as the Covenants themselves National and Solemn League:
- (3) That the Free Church, in spite of the commendable stand she had made on behalf of religious liberty, had hitherto failed to identify herself as fully and explicitly with the Church of the Second Reformation as had done the founders of the Secession; and that the late Declaratory Act of the Free Church had made no material change for the better in her position, inasmuch as it made no clear and unambiguous declaration of adherence to the Westminster Standards, either as standards of conjunction and uniformity for the three kingdoms, or even as tests, with the single exception of the

Confession of Faith, and inasmuch as it made no explicit acknowledgment of the proper and continued obligation of our National Covenants. The Act itself moreover had no judicial authority as a term of fellowship in the Free Church, and indeed left her—so far as the standards and the Covenants were concerned—precisely where she was before the Disruption :

- (4) That though full liberty was allowed to Seceders uniting with the Free Church to use all constitutional means for the promotion of their principles, this would fail to compensate for the withdrawal of a joint ecclesiastical testimony on behalf of them.

These resolutions were seconded by the *Rev. John Aitken* of Aberdeen, the father of the Synod. A debate followed which extended over two days, after which the vote was taken, with the result that there voted for Dr M'Crie's motion 18 ministers and 14 elders, 32 in all ; for Mr Anderson's amendment 13 ministers and 18 elders, 31 in all, making a majority of one in favour of Union. When the result was known, the *Rev. John Aitken* immediately produced and read a protest, in which the minority declared their determination to maintain the position which had been abandoned by the majority, and also laid claim to be regarded as constitutionally the Synod of United Original Seceders. They declared, moreover, their intention to meet as a Synod at half-past ten that day, being Thursday, 29th April, 1852, in Mains Street Church, Glasgow. Thereupon the protesting party withdrew, and having reassembled in Mains Street Church, appointed *Rev. John Aitken* as Moderator and the *Rev. George Roger, Auchinleck*, as Synod Clerk.*

* This office he filled with credit till his decease, his successors being the *Rev. W. B. Gardiner* and the *Rev. James Young*.

Some formal matters arising out of the protest were then dealt with, and the Synod was closed, the next meeting being appointed for the 26th of June.

B.—Reconstruction after the split of 1852.

When the Synod met again on the 26th of June, Mr Anderson, Carluke, was appointed Moderator, and great zeal was shown in taking means to maintain and carry on the various agencies of the Church. This was no small task. The Synod was not, however, lacking in the spirit needful for such an enterprise, and was not destitute of the ability without which the attempt, humanly speaking, would have been foredoomed to failure. One of their number, the *Rev. David A. Sturrock* of Midholm, was the author of several volumes that were held in high estimation, including "A Catechism for the Times," "The Remembrancer," and "Secret Religion Illustrated." Three of the ministers who adhered to the protest, *Rev. Thomas Manson*, *Rev. Matthew Murray*, and *Rev. John Blakely*, received in course of time the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity.

The institution of a *Divinity Hall* was one of the most important matters accomplished at this meeting of Synod. The *Rev. Matthew Murray*, Mains Street, Glasgow, was appointed Professor of Systematic Theology, and filled this chair with much acceptance till his death in 1875. In 1874, the *Rev. W. F. Aitken*, Glasgow, was appointed Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament and New Testament Exegesis, and worthily carried on this work till compelled in 1895 to resign on account of enfeebled health. After this the *Rev. Professor James Spence* who had occupied the chair of Systematic Theology since the death of Professor Murray, was transferred to the chair of Hebrew and Old Testament and New Testament Exegesis, the duties of which he has since con-

tinued to discharge with much acceptance. Recently he received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from St. Andrews University. In 1923 he was succeeded in the chair of Biblical Criticism by the Rev. F. Davidson, B.D., Paisley. Since the transference of Professor Spence in 1895 from the Professorship of Theology to that of Biblical Criticism the chair of Systematic Theology and Church History has been occupied by Rev. Professor Robert Morton. During his years of labour as Professor of Theology, and as pastor in Perth and in Mains Street, Glasgow, Professor Morton has won great respect and confidence outside the denomination as well as within, and in 1923 received the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity from Glasgow University. In 1906 a lectureship of Pastoral Theology was instituted, each lecturer to hold the appointment for three years. The lecturers have been Rev. Thomas Matthew, Rev. James Patrick, Rev. John Sturrock, Rev. George Anderson, Dr Alexander Smellie, Rev. James Young and Rev. E. A. Davidson.

The establishing of a Divinity Hall was not the only work of value done by the Synod in 1852. Of scarcely less importance was the step taken in commencing afresh the *denominational magazine*. An editor was found in the person of the Rev. Thomas Manson, Perth, and a new series was begun. One editor after another has since been raised up, and whilst each one has had his own distinctive features in the editorial department, all have done their work with credit to themselves and to the Secession Church. The editors in succession have been—the Rev. Drs. Manson and Blakely; and the Rev. Messrs James Smellie and Roger, jointly; Mr Smellie alone; Rev. John Sturrock; Professor Morton; Rev. Peter McVicar; and the Rev. R. Hobart, M.A., the present editor. Throughout its history the magazine has proved a strong defender of Reforma-

tion Principles, and a witness to the danger of neglecting and despising them.

Besides taking steps to re-organise the ordinary activities of the denomination, the Synod in 1852 resolved to improve the occasion of their meeting in 1853 by solemnly engaging in a *renewal of the Covenants* as had been done in connection with the Unions of 1828 and 1842. It was felt that after the crisis through which the Church had passed, a step of this kind would be appropriate. Accordingly on Wednesday, 27th April 1853, in Mains Street Church, Glasgow, after much previous prayer and preparation, the Synod engaged in the solemn work of renewing our National Covenants. A similar renewal of the Covenants took place in 1866, also in Mains Street Church. About this time also, in 1870, the congregation in Mains Street, Glasgow, entered into a similar bond. The third and last occasion on which the Synod engaged in renewing the Covenants was in connection with the fraternal union formed with the *Irish Secession Synod*. "The Burgher and Anti-Burgher Synods in Ireland had united in 1818, forming the Irish Secession Synod. This Synod in 1840 united with the Presbyterian Church in Ireland known as the Synod of Ulster, forming the present General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church. Some six congregations of the Secession Church however, declined to enter this union . . . retaining the name of the Irish Secession Church. After nearly six years of friendly negotiation a fraternal union was formed in 1873 between it and the Scottish United Original Secession Synod. This union was consummated in Belfast on 12th August 1873." The Rev. John Robertson, Ayr, Moderator of the Scottish Synod, presided on the occasion, and after the necessary formal documents had been read by the Clerks of the two Synods, he and the Rev. John W. Gamble, the Irish Moderator, declared the Union consummated, and the members

of both Synods shook hands and congratulated each other on what had been so happily brought to pass. The union was followed by the work of Covenant renovation according to use and wont.

The Synod meeting of 1853 was also signalised by its activity in taking steps to foster *Home Mission Work* of various kinds. The Synod resolved to give every encouragement to any Home Mission already existing in connection with the Church, and also appointed a Committee to enquire what more might be done. Mr (afterwards Dr) Blakely, was made convener of this Committee, the work of which he discharged with great resource and tactfulness till his death thirteen years later. His successors in the convenership have been Rev. Messrs James Smellie, John Ritchie, Peter MacVicar, James Young, and Alexander Parker. Since the institution of the Committee, mission agencies have been at work in connection with congregations at Ayr, Kilmarnock, Glasgow, Pollokshaws, Kirkcaldy and Edinburgh, their activities meeting in not a few instances with encouraging success.

The *Foreign Missionary effort* of the Church was of later date. Proposals to undertake such work had been made prior to the Disruption of 1852, but had fallen through, owing to the unsettlement attending that event. Not till sixteen years after did the Synod venture to embark upon this enterprise. In 1868, however, in connection with the Home Mission Report, the subject was brought forward. A resolution was passed expressing a sense of the greatness of the obligation to undertake such work, and a Foreign Mission Committee was appointed with the Rev. James Smellie as Convener. It was found that Mr George Anderson, a divinity student, who was then acting as home missionary in Pollokshaws, was willing to go to the foreign field. In a lengthened report to the Synod in 1871, the Committee referred to the peculiarly strong claims of India; and on the advice of Mr Cooper,

of the Free Church, Nagpore, they recommended the selection, as the centre of their mission, of the town of Seoni, in the Gond country in the Central Provinces, a district not yet occupied by a single missionary. Mr Anderson was accordingly ordained at the close of the Hall and, with Mrs Anderson, sailed from Glasgow on 29th August 1871. After seventeen years' work he resigned in 1888 on account of his health, and returned to this country. "Mr Anderson has the credit and honour of laying the foundation of the Mission at Seoni, which, from small beginnings, and under his early exertions and fostering care, has now attained considerable dimensions, and his memory will long be warmly cherished on this account." The second missionary was the Rev. Edward White, who went out with Mr Anderson in October 1881. After a few years of mutually helpful service, Mr White, owing to the state of his wife's health was under the necessity of resigning. From 1888 till 1890, Mr Robert Blakely acted as teacher and catechist. The Rev. David Finlayson was ordained in October 1889, and had the active charge of the Seoni Mission till June 1898, when he resigned. The present Missionary is the Rev. John M'Neel. Coming originally from the Associate Presbyterian Church in America, he was ordained in 1897. Since then he has superintended all the departments of the Seoni Mission with outstanding success, and much acceptance. In December 1900, Miss Jeannie Grant, M.B., Ch.B., sailed for India, where her services as medical missionary have been highly valued. Five years later Miss Elizabeth MacLeod, daughter of a leading Free Church Minister, went to Seoni, and has since carried on a valuable work among the women in the Zenanas. In 1921, Miss Joan M'Farlane was added to the staff of the mission as teacher in the Girls' School.

Since its formation the activities of the Mission have greatly extended. The Christian congregation in Seoni has now a native pastor, Daniel Cameron.

Evangelistic work is carried on in the villages by means of native catechists operating from six different outstations. A number of Indian Bible women are engaged in house-to-house visitation under the guidance and direction of Miss MacLeod. An important educational work is also carried on. In addition to the Girls' School already mentioned, there is a Boys' High School with two departments, elementary and higher, both of which have Government authority, and are under Government Inspection. There is a school also in Chhapara of which Mr Thomas is Headmaster, and in all the outstations Sabbath Schools are held, and are well attended. In recognition of his valuable educational services, Mr M'Neel has recently been awarded the Kaiser-i-Hind medal. Other important branches of the Mission work are its Orphanage, its Medical Department, under the charge of Dr Jeannie Grant, and its Theological Class for the training of native preachers and catechists, conducted by Mr M'Neel. The annual expenditure of the Mission is now about two thousand pounds. For many years the income of the Mission has been greatly helped by contributions from the *Associate Synod of North America*, from the *Irish Secession Synod*, and from the *Free Church of Scotland*, which also provides the salary of Miss MacLeod. A sum of over four hundred pounds is derived from Indian sources. The Conveners of the Foreign Mission Committee have been four in number, the Rev. James Smellie, the Rev. W. B. Gardiner, the Rev. Alexander Smellie, D.D., and Rev. Professor Morton, D.D., the present Convener. Under the blessing of God, the work of the Mission has prospered greatly, and extended far beyond its original dimensions.

C. Other activities in the interests of the Kingdom of God.

Mention might be made of many other activities and events in the story of the United Original

Secession Church since its formation in 1842, and more especially after the Disruption of 1852. It would be too large a task to describe in detail the attitude that has been taken up by the denomination in regard to the many changing tendencies that have manifested themselves in Church and State during that period. There has been at times good reason for protest against departures from *the great and Scriptural ideals of the Reformation period*. There has at other times been reason for rejoicing at developments which have been fruitful of much good. In various ways endeavours have been made to promote the interests of the Kingdom of Christ, and to strengthen the hands of all those engaged in His service. Speaking of this, it is fitting to mention the well-known historical and devotional writings of the late *Dr Alexander Smellie* whose influence has made itself felt in all parts of the world, and whose memory is cherished in all the churches.

A history of the denomination would be incomplete without reference to its specially close relationship with the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*. Between the two there has always been a close similarity of outlook. This is specially true in regard to the branch of the Reformed Presbyterian Church which was left in the minority when that Church divided in 1863. The majority ultimately joined the Free Church in 1876, but the other section still retains its identity. With this section the Original Secession Church has held from time to time friendly conferences concerning Union. In 1874 a joint report issued by the Union Committees of both Churches was brought before their respective Synods. This report made plain that there was complete harmony of view regarding the obligation of the National Covenants, and the defects of the Revolution Settlement, and, indeed, *in all points except the question as to whether such Acts as taking the Oath of Allegiance, and*

exercising the Franchise, did or did not involve complicity in the attitude of the Government in disregarding the obligation of our National Covenants. The Original Secession Church has always held that such Acts are legitimate, and do not involve any complicity in the Nation's attitude towards the Covenants: the Reformed Presbyterian Church has taken the opposite view. This has so far prevented any nearer approach to the consummation of Union between the two Churches, but annually deputies are sent by each Church to the Synodical meeting of the other.

An outline has now been traced of the history of the Secession Church in its three periods: its root before 1733, its budding and branching from 1733 to 1842, and its present representative branch, the United Original Secession Church from 1842 to 1923. The following section of the book will deal with the doctrinal position of the Church, a great heritage from the past.

II. DOCTRINE.

A. God and Religion.

By the

Rev. Professor R. MORTON, D.D.,
Glasgow.

THE CONCEPTION OF GOD.

Its pivotal place.

Its scriptural source.

PAGES

A. Transcendence of God - - - 53-57

His existence before and apart from the universe implying :

- (1) Trinity. The term person.
- (2) Creator. Universe and man.
- (3) Providence. Room for miracles.

B. Immanence of God - - - 57-58

The pervasion of the universe by God implying :

- (1) Omnipresence.
- (2) Omniscience.
- (3) Spirituality.

C. Redemptive Purpose of God - - 58-61

Prompted by love, God interposes historically in our world of sin, implying :

- (1) Bible.
- (2) Election.
- (3) Fatherhood.

D. Response to God - - - 61-62

Man's attitude to, and conception of, the Higher Powers create his religion.

- (1) The lower or impersonal religions.
- (2) The higher or personal religions.
- (3) Christianity the supreme or true religion.

GOD AND RELIGION

The conception of God is regulative in the whole sphere of religion, indeed, in the whole sphere of our human life. Find out what a person's conception of God is, and you will find out at the same time that this is determining the complexion of the whole life. Hence the importance of having a right and worthy conception implanted in the mind. *Such a conception must be based upon and derived from that self-revelation of God given in the Bible* There we are taught what we are to believe concerning God, and any ideas of God that do not harmonise with the plain teaching of God's Word must be rejected. That self-revelation of God in the Bible is progressive and finds its culmination in the Person and teaching of Jesus Christ. We are warranted to test any conception of God that may offer itself for our acceptance by this revelation of God given in Jesus and in His teaching. In that revelation there are some things about God made very prominent.

A. Transcendence of God.

There is what is called His Transcendence—His existence before the created universe, and His existence apart from it. In the beginning, before the universe came into existence, God was. That significant statement stands on the threshold of the revelation of God given in the Old Testament. It is supplemented by a statement made in the New Testament, bringing before us the fact that God was not a lonely Being, but that within the sphere of the Divine existence there was a fellowship. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."

There was a fulness of life within the Divine Being in entire independence of the created universe. Glimpses are given to us throughout the Bible of an intercourse and fellowship within the circle of the Divine life that are eternal and not in any way dependent on anything outside of it. On this has been based the doctrine of the TRINITY OF PERSONS in the Godhead—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—enjoying intimate and blessed fellowship. The word “Person” is a term thrown out at a revealed relationship that is real but is mysterious. It indicates something more than three modes or aspects of the one Divine life, and something less than three distinct individuals. There is the one Godhead, but in the life of this one Godhead there are these three personae (when the term was first used it was a common designation of different characters in a drama *personae dramatis*), “the same in substance, equal in power and glory.” This doctrine of a triune God—three in one and one in three—while it has mystery attached to it, is central in Christianity. It has been noted that any error that has arisen in the history of the Christian Church has started from rejecting some element of this doctrine or has issued in that rejection.

It was from the triune God that the universe came into being. This brings before us God as the CREATOR of all things. “He spake and it was done. He commanded and it stood fast.” The idea of Divine creation contains these three things:—

1. There was no being existing outside the Divine life before the creative word was uttered.
2. In response to that creative word, the mass, of which the universe is composed, came into existence, and into an existence outside the Divine being, though in dependence upon it.

3. This mass, which was without form and void, a chaos and lifeless, was gradually brought into order, and an order instinct with life of various kinds, into a cosmos by a Divine action ascribed to the third person of the Godhead—the Divine Spirit.

The process by which this transformation was effected has left marks on the structure of the universe, which it is the business of science to discover and explain.

At the apex of creation stands the creation of man, made as to his body out of the material of which the universe is composed, as to his spirit a participant in the life which the Spirit had infused throughout Nature, but over and above all this, divinely endowed with a soul that came directly to him from God, and lifted him high above the level of all other creatures. *This elevation of man is not in the Bible presented as attained by man through a gradual development of his power, but as directly given to him by God.* God “breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul.” God imparted to him a life like His Own, and so the Divine Image was stamped upon him. He was a creaturely copy of God. The mission for which man was created was to utilise the resources divinely stored in the universe, and in discharging this task to develop his own powers—to find himself as it were, and so realise the ideal which the Creator had for him. A single individual could not accomplish this, and so in his creation there was provided a mate for him, through which a race might spring from him. He was constituted the head of this human race, and with him in this representative capacity God dealt, coming under obligation to reward him and the race on condition of obedience to His will, and giving warning of the consequences of disobedience. This is what is known as the *Covenant of Works*. Man did not stand the test to which he was divinely subjected, but turned aside from the

path of obedience and in this way came under the power of sin. A remedial scheme then became necessary, and was at once put into execution, the account of which belongs to another department. The universe with man at the summit as thus created by God has its existence and life constantly dependent upon Him. In Him—the Eternal Son—all things consist or hold together. Not only is it thus every moment dependent upon Him, but in all its movements is under His control and made to carry out His behests. “He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of earth.”

This brings before us the doctrine of DIVINE PROVIDENCE. It embraces everything from the fall of a sparrow to the dissolution and disappearance of a world. Nothing can happen to an individual or to a community that has not been arranged for or permitted by Him. There are these two aspects of God's reign, what He has positively enacted, and what he has permitted for wise and holy reasons. All that flows from the sin of man comes under the last category—what He has permitted—for we cannot think of God, and must not think of God as positively enacting anything that is sinful. He is “glorious in holiness.” What He permits is overruled by Him in marvellous ways to contribute to the accomplishment of His gracious design. In thus enacting and overruling He can introduce forces into the ordered universe that can change the ordinary current of events. *Room is in this way made for what is designated Miracles.* Some have pictured the universe as so under the reign of law, that any force coming from without, even from such a source as God, would be altogether inadmissible. God as transcendent is thus excluded from the universe that has come from His creating Hand. Man can manipulate these laws of Nature so as to reach ends that he has in view. The yachtsman can so arrange his sails that he drives his vessel almost in the teeth of the strong wind.

And will this power that undoubtedly belongs to man be denied to God the Creator of the universe and man? A miracle does not necessarily involve a "suspension of the laws of Nature," and so a break in the order of Nature. That is a misconception of what takes place in the working of a miracle. It is simply the introduction of a new force, so quickening, strengthening, and guiding the ordinary forces of Nature, that they achieve something which by themselves they would never achieve. Room must be made for God doing this in the universe. He is a God that does wonders.

B. Immanence of God.

While the Transcendence of God is prominent in the self-revelation given in the Bible, not less prominent is His Immanence. While He exists outside the universe and independent of it, He at the same time pervades that universe. Trace to its source the life of the humblest plant, and it leads you to God, the source and immediate sustainer of all life.

"Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies:—
Hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
Little flower, but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all
I should know what God and man is."

Seek to trace the higher life with which man has been endowed, and it leads you to the same quarter. This was a truth Paul stated in significant terms to the Athenians in speaking to them of the unknown God to whom they had reared an altar. He is not "God far off from any one of us. For in Him we live, and move, and have our being." In this pervasion of the universe by God there is involved these three things about Him—His OMNIPRESENCE. He can be everywhere present at the same moment of time. His OMNISCIENCE—everything in its inner essence and possibilities, and so every development

is plainly before His searching Mind: and His SPIRITUALITY—distinction of His Being from all material things. There is the grand statement of Christ “God is Spirit.”

C. Redemptive Purpose of God.

God as thus transcendent and immanent is presented in this self-revelation given in the Bible as carrying out a great redeeming purpose, prompted by His great love. Sin by its entrance had induced man to leave the path of obedience, along which the Divine ideal for him could alone be realised. It introduced an alien element into the life of man, and into the life of the universe that brought disturbance into the relationship between God and man, between man and man, and between man and the universe. That disturbance, if it had been allowed to continue and produce its natural effects, would have involved man and the universe in ruin, and would have defeated the purpose God had in creating them. God had provided against this, and had formed a *plan of redemption*, by which the effects of the entrance of sin would be undone, and the ideal for man and the universe would be realised, and realised more perfectly than if sin had never entered. In this plan, and in the execution of it, the entrance of sin is overruled to bring greater glory to God and greater good to man. “Where sin abounded grace did much more abound.” This plan or purpose of God places Him before us as a God who is Love, Whose thoughts towards us from eternity have been thoughts of peace and not of evil. In the execution of this plan we find Him interposing in the history of the world and of the human race upon it, introducing a redeeming force. He interposes to give a revelation of Himself as carrying out this redeeming purpose. The fruit of this interposition, continued at intervals through a wide stretch of history is found in the BIBLE. In it we have a record of God’s approach to men revealing

Himself with increasing clearness and fulness in this aspect, as carrying out this gracious redeeming purpose. The culmination of the revelation is found in Him who was God manifest in the flesh.

“God who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son.”

We misunderstand the real character of the Bible until we view it as a faithful record of these self-revealing interpositions of God, and a record that God has used, and still uses in approaching us in His redeeming love. *It is not a record of man's groping after God, and gradually making fuller discoveries of Him, but a record of God's seeking men to save them, and the response given to Him.*

This character possessed by the Bible marks it off from all other kinds of literature in which we have the expression of human thought and investigation. In this self-revealing interposition God selected organs through whom this revelation might be given. He took possession of them, and by lifting them in some way above the ordinary level of their lives, gave them disclosures of His mind and will that they might communicate them to others.

“Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit.” It is, too, by an interposition of a similar kind that He secures a response to this revelation of Himself, and begins a new Divine Life within the nature that has been dead through trespasses and sins. This interposition is known as *Regeneration*, and is effected by God's Spirit through the instrumentality of the Word. Here again there is selection, some being chosen to be thus quickened and brought into fellowship with God, and chosen that they might be agents in the hands of God and His Spirit in conveying the Divine Life to others. This **ELECTION** is an essential part of the eternal plan. “God hath blessed us who believe with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ. According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the

world that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love." It is the method that God has ever pursued in working toward the accomplishment of His purpose, to undo the effects of sin in man and in the universe.

In all this the name by which Jesus addresses God, and speaks of God—the name of FATHER—has its significance unfolded. There is the name Father itself expressive of the relation in which God stands to all the members of the human race. Sin has drawn us away from this relationship, leading us to renounce our sonship to God. We have, under the influence of sin, left His household, and joined ourselves to another household of which the great adversary of God and man is the head. But God's fatherly heart yearned for the return of His wandered children, and has come after them seeking to bring them back. They who respond to His approach are warmly welcomed back, given the place from which they had wandered, and treated as if they had never wandered. Their sins are not only forgiven but forgotten. They who refuse His gracious approach, who continue to refuse it, are condemned to live in exile from His household, and so in a separation from Him which means death to the highest life of which we are capable. For the epithet Holy linked with Father, *Holy Father*, is a clear indication that sin must be forsaken ere fellowship with Him can be enjoyed. His nature reacts against all sin with loathing. "He is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and He cannot look upon sin." They who cling to sin in any shape or form must suffer exclusion from His fellowship, and that exclusion involves the loss of everything worth being called life. In suffering this exclusion they sow as they have reaped, and simply suffer the due reward of their deeds. For there is also the epithet Righteous linked to this name Father, *Righteous Father*. All His dealing with His creatures are in harmony with the strictest justice, and will in the end be universally acknow-

ledged to possess this character. Every one will receive in the end that to which he is entitled on the ground of his real character. There is implied in this that the *real* in distinction from the *assumed* or *apparent* character, is clearly discerned by God. *Omniscience* belongs to Him. "All things are naked and open unto Him. And with this Fatherhood there is linked universal Lordship. *Father, Lord of heaven and earth.* It is the will of the Heavenly Father that is supreme, and will in the end overcome all opposition. The prayer Christ puts into the lips and into the hearts of His disciples open with these significant words, "Our Father which art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name, Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done on earth as it is in Heaven."

D. Response to God.

The conception of God that lies at its basis determines the real value of any religion. The term religion means something that binds, and the design of religion is to bind the spirit to God. The moral strength and fruitfulness of the tie will be determined by the conception of God that is found in it. There is a certain idea of God behind the fetish worship existing among rude and uncivilised tribes, but it is very vague and shadowy. Behind all other religions that are on a higher level, there are ideas of God that are more definite. This broad distinction may be drawn between them—the *idea of God in which personality is ascribed to Him, and the idea of God from which this personality is absent*, and He is identified with some impersonal force behind all things or as the sum-total of the forces at work in the universe. But none of these conceptions will stand comparison in respect of moral value and influence with that lying at the foundation of the *Christian religion*. In all these other conceptions He is regarded as a Being or a Force,

inspiring dread, exacting sacrifices from devotees to placate. All these other religions have as their driving force this principle of dread. The religion of which Christ, the Revealer of God as Father, is the centre has, as its driving force, the principle of love; God is revealed not as exacting sacrifice, but as giving Himself in sacrifice to rescue us from the guilt and power of sin. By this marvellous manifestation of His love He awakens love to Himself within our hearts—a love that compels us to self-sacrifice for Him, and the advancement of His cause. Without this love thus inspired real Christianity is wanting. (I. Corinthians xiii.)

II. DOCTRINE.

B. Jesus and the Gospel.

By the
Rev. THOMAS MATTHEW,
Kilwinning.

This Subject the Sun in the System of Saving Truth.

	PAGES
A. Jesus is the Son of God - - -	65-67
Sonship of men and angels.	
Sonship of Jesus unique.	
The Deity of Jesus.	
B. Jesus is the Son of Man - - -	67-68
A Real Humanity.	
Why Become Human;	
—to Suffer.	
to Mediate.	
to Sympathise.	
C. Life and Character of Jesus - - -	68-70
The Silent Years.	
The Fourfold Portrait.	
(1) His Sinlessness.	
(2) His Benevolence.	
(3) His Love.	
(4) His Humility.	
D. Cross of Jesus - - - -	70-71
Messianic claims.	
Jewish hatred: Roman authority.	
Prophecy fulfilled.	
E. Resurrection of Jesus - - -	71-72
On third day, the first of week.	
Fully attested.	
Confirmation of all claims.	
F. Gospel of Jesus - - - -	72-74
Based on above historical facts.	
Sum in John iii. 16 and 2 Cor. v.	
19-21.	
Deliverance from double condemna-	
tion.	
G. Freeness of the Gospel Offer - - -	74-75
A wondrous gift.	
Unmerited and unearned.	
Proffered to our need.	

JESUS AND THE GOSPEL.

The subject of this chapter lies at the very centre of Divine Revelation. It is the sun in the system – the keystone in the arch of revealed and saving truth. All other Bible truths hold their place with relation to it and derive their value from it. What the soul is to the body, animating every member of it, that Jesus and His Gospel are to the Bible, giving life and meaning and power to all its parts, from the Opening Promise given in Eden, “I will put enmity between thee and the woman,” etc., to the closing invitation in the Book of Revelation, “The Spirit and the Bride say, Come,” etc. Besides, it is our attitude to this which determines the present state and the future destiny of every one of us. If we receive Christ and His Gospel with the full consent of our hearts we are saved. If we reject them or neglect them we are lost. There is no alternative. “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” It is therefore a matter of supreme importance to every member of our fallen race that we should know what the Bible has to tell us of this momentous theme.

A.—Jesus is the Son of God.

All of us are “Sons of God” by *creation*. “Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?” All believers are “Sons of God” by *adoption* and *regeneration*. “As many as received Him to them gave He power to become the ‘Sons of God,’ even to them that believe on His name.” Holy Angels are “Sons of God”

through *creation* and *close moral resemblance*. It is of them the inspired writer speaks: "The morning stars sang together and the 'Sons of God' shouted for joy," when this fair world of ours was brought into being. But it is in a far higher sense than in that of men or of angels that the Lord Jesus is the Son of God. He is His "Only-Begotten Son"—having a Sonship peculiar to Himself and altogether unique. He is His Son by eternal generation and so is entitled to say "I and My Father are one." "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father"—the same in substance and equal in power and glory with the Father and the Spirit. His Deity is proved by *names* peculiar to the Godhead being freely applied to Him. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," says the Psalmist in the 45th Psalm. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God," says John in the Prologue to his Gospel. "My Lord, and My God," exclaims Thomas, when convinced of His Master's Resurrection. It is further proved by Divine *attributes* being ascribed to Him, such as Omnipotence—"All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth;" Omniscience—"Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee;" and Omnipresence—"Lo, I am with you alway." A further proof is found in *works* which none but God could perform being said to be wrought by Him—Creation, Providence and Redemption; while the *worship*, which it would be idolatry to offer to a creature, is repeatedly offered to Him and accepted by Him. In the Baptismal Formula and in the Apostolic Benediction, He is placed on an equality with the Father and the Spirit. From all this then it is evident that the Socinians or Unitarians who affirm that our Lord was a mere man, and the Arians that He existed prior to His birth merely as a super-angelic spirit, and is therefore only a creature, are guilty of denying a large part of

Holy Scripture and of robbing the Son of God of the Glory due to His name.

B.—Jesus is the Son of Man.

This was the name by which our Lord usually called Himself in the days of His flesh, and while its use evidenced His humility it chiefly expressed His sense of being a sharer of our common nature, being “bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh,” having a true body and a reasonable soul just as we have, and liable to all the sinless infirmities to which we are subject—hunger, thirst, weariness, and grief. “He took not on Him the nature of Angels but He took on Him the seed of Abraham.” As He was “very God of very God,” so He was as really man as any of us; and thus after the assumption of our nature He was the God man, having two distinct natures in one Person, and retaining these for ever. He was man that He might be capable of suffering. He was God to give infinite value to His sufferings. *He was Man to give satisfaction to offended Justice in the same nature as had sinned*; it was man that broke the law, and man therefore had to keep it perfectly and to bear the penalty due to the breach of it. And He was God to be a “fit Daysman to lay His hand upon us both”—to deal with God on our behalf and to deal with us on God’s behalf. And once more, He was Man that He might sympathise with us in all our sorrows and be a “Brother born for adversity.” And He was God to make His sympathy effective. “Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood He also Himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.” And having in our nature as the Son of Man finished the work which the Father gave Him to do the highest possible

distinction has been put upon that nature, and it is now "The Dust of the earth that sits upon the throne of the universe."

C.—Life and Character of Jesus.

Born of a Virgin Mother and reared in a peasant's home among the uplands of Galilee, He passed the first thirty years of His earthly life in almost complete obscurity. Only once, when He had reached the age of twelve years, does He come forth into the light. But we may be sure that the words He spoke then gave truthful expression to the purpose and achievement of these silent years: "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" or "in My Father's house?" When He entered on His public life at the age of thirty the Four Evangelists furnish us with independent records of His movements from place to place, of His miracles and of His teaching; and each of them closes with a more or less detailed account of His Sufferings and Death and Resurrection, thereby indicating the special significance attaching to these.

The most striking features of His character as they have depicted it for us are:

(1) His *Sinlessness*—"tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." Coming into daily contact with moral corruption in the hearts and lives of his fellow-countrymen, yet remaining pure and uncontaminated like a ray of sunlight falling upon a dunghill and revealing its foulness yet catching no impurity from it, "He was holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners." Had such a life not been lived no Jewish Evangelist ever could have depicted it.

(2) His *Unfailing Benevolence*. All through His public ministry "He went about doing good." The miracles that He wrought were miracles of mercy and not judgment. He drew to Himself women and little children, and classes repelled by

the austerity of other teachers were attracted to Him. He exemplified in Himself the picture that He drew of the Good Samaritan who was ready to help those that needed help. His path through the world was like that of the sun through the heavens, dispensing blessings wherever it shines.

(3) His *Self-Sacrificing Love*. Love is the fairest flower that blooms in the garden of this world, and of all love that which is pure and unselfish is the most winsome. Now this is what the apostle tells us of Christ. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that though he was rich yet for your sakes He became poor that ye through His poverty might be rich." And again the same apostle says, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made Himself of no reputation (emptied Himself), and took upon Him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death even the death of the cross." Out of pure, unpurchased love to hell-deserving sinners such as we, He laid aside for the time His robes of glory and took the place and wore the garb and bore the doom of a convicted felon. Was ever love like His?

(4) The only other feature of our Lord's character on which we shall dwell is His *Humility*. Having made the tremendous stoop of which we have just spoken, He could rightly present Himself as a model for our imitation. "Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart." On one occasion when about to take food with His disciples He rose from the table and girded Himself with a towel, and having poured water into a basin He proceeded to wash His disciples' feet—a service usually rendered by the humblest menial in an Oriental home. And having finished the self abasing task He said to the twelve, "Ye call Me Master and Lord, and ye say well for so I am. If I then, your Lord and

Master, have washed your feet ye also ought to wash one another's feet." By which he meant you should count nothing beneath you if thereby you can promote the comfort or well-being of your fellow-Christians. Take the lowest room if thereby you can do the greatest good.

D.—Cross of Jesus.

At the time when our Lord appeared there was a general expectation among His countrymen of the coming of their Messiah. But the Messiah that they desired and expected was a political and military leader who would break the yoke of Roman domination and make Jerusalem the capital of a great world-power, such as Rome then was. Our Lord did not fulfil these expectations. He was a spiritual not a carnal Messiah; and the Kingdom He came to establish was not "of this world." He came to free men from the bondage of sin and Satan, to subdue their hearts to Himself, and in due time to make the whole world subject to Him as its Saviour and Sovereign. Such being the purpose of His mission, He denounced prevailing sins, and did not spare the hypocrisy and avarice of the Jewish leaders—the self-righteous Pharisees and the worldly priesthood. This excited their bitter enmity against Him. And as He claimed to be the Son of God, "making Himself equal with God," and the true Messiah that had been promised to the fathers, they condemned Him in the Sanhedrin on the charge of blasphemy, and got Pilate to condemn Him in the Roman Court on the charge of treason. And both being capital offences, they demanded His death. To this demand Pilate, conscious of His innocence, reluctantly assented, and accordingly He was nailed to the accursed tree—a Roman form of punishment usually reserved for slaves, and being one of the most shameful and painful and lingering forms of public execution then in use. *But though the crucifixion of Jesus was*

grossly unjust, it was the fulfilment of God's eternal purpose, and to this Peter refers in his sermon on the Day of Pentecost, "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledged of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." And that purpose had found expression in the very first promise given after the Fall and frequently repeated throughout the Old Testament in type and symbol and vicarious sacrifice. Nowhere is it more clearly set forth than in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah: "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." Under the crushing weight of Divine wrath for human sin when in the garden of Gethsemane, He sweat as it were great drops of blood and cried out, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death," and while hanging on the Cross of Calvary He exclaimed, "My Ged, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" This painful experience was the Second Death—the full penalty for sin which He willingly endured in the room of all those given Him by the Father. "Christ suffered for our sins, the Just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." "He who knew no sin became sin for us that we might be made the Righteousness of God in Him." And hence the believer glorying like the Great Apostle in the Cross of Jesus can say :

Upon a life I did not live, Upon a death I did not die,
Another's life, Another's death, I stake my whole eternity.

E.—Resurrection of Jesus.

On the third day after His death and burial which was the first day of the following week, our Lord rose from the grave of Joseph in which He had been interred. He thus fulfilled repeated

predictions uttered by Himself "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." "As Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Although no human eye witnessed the fact of the Resurrection of our Lord, there were many who saw Him after He rose. And though at first some of His disciples—notably Thomas—were hard to convince of the fact, yet the evidence became to their mind so overwhelming that they were prepared to give their own life in testimony of it, and in some instances, actually did so. On ten different recorded occasions He appeared—sometimes to one, at other times to several, and on one occasion to as many as 500 brethren at once; while Paul on the way to Damascus as "One born out of due season" saw the Risen and Exalted Saviour, and received his Apostolic Commission from His lips. *By His Resurrection the Seal of Heaven was placed upon His whole life-work, and all the lofty claims that He made were confirmed.* As Paul expresses it, "He was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness by His Resurrection from the dead." And, rising as the First-fruits of them that slept, His Resurrection is the Prophecy, the Pattern and the Pledge of ours. He also proved the truth of His own words, "No man taketh My life from Me, but I lay it down of Myself; I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received from My Father." "I am the Resurrection and the Life."

F.—Gospel of Jesus.

Now the truths which we have briefly stated constitute The Gospel of Christ—the substance of that Message which all the Apostles and all Apostolic preachers have proclaimed throughout all the Christian centuries. Our Lord Himself put it into a nutshell in His conversation with Nicodemus, "God so

loved the world that He gave His Only-Begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." And Paul summarises it in these words to the Corinthians, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ as though God did beseech you by us : we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For He hath made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." The Apostle here recognises the sorrowful fact that by nature we are all in a state of guilt and alienation from God—that we have been ruined by the Fall, and by our own personal choice of evil instead of good, and are consequently under a righteous sentence of condemnation. We are twice condemned, first by the law because we have not kept it, since it is written, "Cursed is everyone that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law to do them," and then by the Gospel, because we have not believed it. "He that believeth not is condemned already." But to us *in this condition of double condemnation the Gospel comes with its offer of full forgiveness and of renewal of heart*—not the removal of the guilt of sin merely, but the destruction of its power and our restoration to the favour of God through Christ's All-prevailing Mediation. In our natural state we are like a man that has been convicted of a capital crime, and is lying in the condemned cell awaiting the day of execution. But, besides that, he has been attacked by a fatal disease, which has undermined his health, and is hastening him to the tomb. Now it is evident that it is not enough for such a man that he get a free pardon, even though it were signed by the King's own hand, and sealed with his signet. That no doubt would open his prison door and set him at liberty, freeing him from the ignominy of a public execution. But it would

not preserve his life. What he needs is an effectual remedy for his fatal malady along with the remission of his death sentence. And to us both blessings are offered in the Gospel. And when we thankfully receive them we can sing with the Psalmist of the 103rd Psalm :—

“Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits, Who forgiveth all thine iniquities, Who healeth all thy diseases.”

G.—Freeness of the Gospel Offer.

Our Lord Jesus, by His obedience unto death, fulfilled the condition of the Covenant of Grace, and purchased a full redemption for all His people. What cost Him so much is offered to us “without money and without price.” It is free as the air we breathe, or as the light that beams upon us from the morning sun. “My Father giveth you the true Bread from Heaven” said our Lord. It is a gift—a Divine Gift; and what can be freer than a gift? “Ho, every one that thirsteth come ye to the waters,” cries the Evangelical prophet, and our Lord Himself uses the same figure of speech, “If any man thirst let him come unto Me and drink,” while the volume of Inspiration almost closes with the gracious invitation, “*The Spirit and the Bride say Come, and let him that heareth say Come, and let him that is athirst Come, and whosoever will let him take the water of life freely.*” “The Redemption of the soul is precious,” so precious that it is quite beyond the resources of any child of Adam to purchase it. If it is ever enjoyed it must be received as a beggar receives an alms without effort or desert. We are, according to the Apostle, “without strength.” Of ourselves we cannot think a right thought, nor do a right action. “Our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.” If therefore our

Salvation depended on our lifting a finger we could not earn it. But since it is free—gratis—all for nothing, there is no reason why the weakest and the worst should continue unsaved.

“Let not conscience make you linger
Nor of fitness fondly dream,
All the fitness He requireth
Is to feel your need of Him,
This He gives you
’Tis the Spirit’s rising beam.”

II. DOCTRINE.

C. The Christian and His Life.

By the

Rev. EBENEZER A. DAVIDSON,
Edinburgh.

**What a man is and what he does
are vitally related.**

	PAGES
A. Definition of a Christian . . .	79-82
(1) UNION WITH A PERSON.	
Implies a new character.	
Individuality conserved.	
(2) OBEDIENCE TO A MASTER.	
Obligation of union.	
Willing to do the will.	
(3) LOYALTY TO A KING.	
A free subjection.	
A case of conscience.	
 B. Resources of the Christian . . .	 82-88
(1) THE HOLY SPIRIT.	
His fruits.	
His indwelling	
(2) PRAYER.	
An evidence of life.	
Subjects of prayer.	
(3) THE BIBLE.	
The supreme rule.	
Essential to the spiritual life.	
(4) WORSHIP.	
The House of God.	
The preached word.	
(5) THE SACRAMENTS.	
Divinely Instituted.	
A real Means of Grace.	
(6) THE LORD'S DAY.	
Natural basis.	
Denial of the higher nature.	
Value.	

THE CHRISTIAN AND HIS LIFE.

Here are two necessary, relative conceptions, reacting upon, imparting colour to, each other, as the tree stands related to its fruit, the source to the stream, determining both kind and character. If Christianity is built upon a creed its illustration and application are seen in the life, and no one who claims to be a believer in the one can demonstrate his faith except by way of the other. According to Apostolic testimony the Christian Church furnished an outstanding proof of applied Christianity:—"Ye are our epistle, known and read of all men." No otherwise can the doctrines embodied in a system find expression and commend themselves as the foundation stones of true and upright living. *Truth demands interpretation in high thinking translated into good words, Christ-like deeds.* else were it nothing more than a dead worthless scheme. It is of first importance then, in any definition, such as is here attempted, to postulate the intimate vital connection between what a man is and what he does.

A. Definition of the Christian.

To be a Christian (*i.e.* a follower of Christ) implies and necessitates:—

(1)—UNION WITH A PERSON.

That is the relationship into which all enter in whom the Spirit works repentance and faith—graces initial, introductory, evangelical. Apart from these there can be no real movement Christ-wards, no turning back with sorrow to the past, no consciousness of sin forgiven, no experience

of old things passed away, and all things become new.

“With my burden I begin,
Lord, remove this load of sin.”

The union thus effected corresponds to the radical change insisted on as necessary and inevitable by such affirmations as these—“Ye must be born again,” “Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven,” “If a man be in Christ he is a new creature.” *The personal element on the sinner’s and on the Saviour’s side* is very pronounced, there being no loss, no sinking of individuality, but rather a union which embraces those features that are the distinguishing and incommunicable property of each. This is the position, and yet at the same time the sinner so joined assumes a new character, cherishes new ideals, is prompted by other motives than those which actuated him in his unregenerate state. “Being made free from sin and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.”

(2)—OBEDIENCE TO A MASTER.

The identity between the soul and Christ, which is illustrated by the vine and its branches, implies certain obligations that necessarily emerge and that demand recognition. These may be summed up under the gracious impositions Christ lays upon His own—“If ye love Me, keep My commandments,” “Ye are My friends if ye do whatsoever I command you.” The believer not only enters into a new relationship but *becomes subject to a new authority*, to whose behests he yields glad obedience. He is content to surrender his will to the new Master—to enquire always and everywhere “Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?”

“Our wills are ours, we know not how,
Our wills are ours to make them Thine.”

This obedience is the spontaneous outcome of a renewed nature that has been emancipated from

the chains of old sins, and that has received a new direction Godwards and towards righteousness. It is rooted not in any legal obsession of what it owes to one in authority, but in a love that is ever conscious of a great debt which it can never repay.

(3)—LOYALTY TO A KING.

He whose life is hid with Christ in God, who recognises a subjection that is not forced but free, knows himself to be a member of a vast community whose limits are in the ends of the earth. "His kingdom ruleth over all," has an interpretation for him that it has not for the world, and therefore Christ claims from him a loyalty that He does not expect from others. An empire to be well-governed does not depend only on the makers but on the keepers of the law. For however good laws may be, however fitted to promote the true interests of a people, they are futile to accomplish their purpose unless there is a disposition to honour and obey.

Bound by indissoluble ties of faith and love to a Redeemer-King, the believer is pledged to advance in his private and relative capacity those principles which are the very essence of Christ's kingdom in the world. It may be his to choose between the will of a temporal sovereign and that of the one Lord, in which case loyalty to his Heavenly Master will leave him in no doubt as to which course he should take. "We ought to obey God rather than men," replied Peter when he and his fellow apostles were brought into conflict with the powers that be. In the interviews that distinguished a critical period of Scottish history, and in which this point was frequently at issue, *the courageous Reformer Knox*, made it very clear to the proud and perverse queen that there was one supreme authority on earth to which all men must bow. "Think ye," quoth she, "that subjects, having

power, may resist their princes?" "If their princes exceed their bounds," quoth he, "Madam, and do against that wherefore they should be obeyed, it is no doubt they may be resisted, even by power.' This is the true balance to strike between loyalty to an earthly and loyalty to a heavenly sovereign. If there is a clashing of interests so that it is impossible to obey both, the path of duty is clear, that God's will is to be preferred before any other. This is an illustration and interpretation of Christ's statement—"No man can serve two Masters." "My conscience I cannot submit," must be the retort whenever and wherever a questionable course is proposed for adoption.

B. Resources of the Christian.

The Christian thus defined and thus declared must maintain his life vigorous and increasing by intimate contact with the sources of nourishment divinely appointed and available.

(1)—THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Supreme among these is the Third Person of the glorious Trinity, concerning whose function Christ testified "The Spirit quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." Actions may be morally good and right, evoking commendation from the lips of men, but to be pleasing in the sight of God they must be the product of this Tree, "For the fruit of the Spirit is Love, Joy, Peace, Longsuffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith, Meekness, Temperance." "Walk in the Spirit," counsels the Apostle, "and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh." And again he lays down a law of the Christian life, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." To be indwelt by this Divine Person is to be under a Guiding Influence that results in high and holy living, in conduct alike acceptable to God and approved by men.

No believer can afford to dispense with Him ; and, since He is one of the gifts of Christ's ascension grace, we are directed in these words to make application : " If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him." The Christian life is one that S. D. Gordon describes as "*a personally-conducted journey,*" and upon this fact does its success depend. Indwelt, controlled, and guided by this great Divine Agent the promise of the Ascended Lord is fulfilled, " Lo, I am with you all the days even unto the end."

(2)—PRAYER.

Prayer is an ordinance which the one born of God must ever find necessary. As the breath is to the body so prayer is to the soul—it attests the fact of life. " Behold he prayeth," was God's intimation to Ananias that " Saul, the persecutor," was a man new-made.

" Prayer is the Christian's vital breath,
The Christian's native air."

He must as soon cease to breathe as, for any length of time, cease to pray. *The holy flame of conscious spiritual life must be kept alive and vigorous by intercourse with the Unseen.* The burdens of the day must be assumed and borne in the strength derived from the one source through definite petition. Temptations must be met and overcome by the re-enforcements that spring into consciousness in reponse to previous waiting upon God.

" Restraining prayer, we cease to fight,
Prayer makes the Christian's armour bright,
And Satan trembles when he sees
The weakest saint upon his knees."

Circumspect walking amid the varying conditions in which duty finds us can be maintained only as the heart is replenished with grace by frequent visits to the Fountain, " Prayer," defines the

Westminster Catechism, "is an offering up of our desires unto God for things agreeable to His will." There are things we may not ask. There are other things we must ask conditionally, submitting our wills to God's will in granting or refusing them; while there are things we may make request for, absolutely assured that they belong to the class embraced in the direction, "Ask and it shall be given you." All grace which the Christian needs for his walking worthy of his high vocation, and for discharging its peculiar responsibilities, should be the burden of believing, importunate, unceasing prayer. "I will not let Thee go," said the wrestling patriarch, "except Thou bless me," and in virtue of the mysterious Combatant's approval, and as an encouragement to succeeding generations in the exercise of this privilege—"He blessed him there."

(3)—THE BIBLE.

If prayer is so needful a feature in the Christian's life, he will find that Bible reading and study constitute a parallel necessity. For "the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him." And, since man's chief end is to glorify and enjoy God, *no one can afford to neglect the one authoritative Book that reveals how this great two-fold purpose in life may be accomplished.* "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." Not through reason but revelation has he attained to the knowledge of that life which is hid with Christ in God, and revelation acquaints him with the path of duty and fixes the measure of his responsibility. He is required to keep within the limits of the "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not" of the commandment by which his life is to be fashioned, to yield himself to the constraints and restraints of that law

for which God bears a strong and abiding affection. Those who honour it He will honour—those who despise it shall be lightly esteemed. To interpret and reflect the will of God the Christian must “give attendance to reading,” “must search the Scriptures diligently” if he would become a living epistle known and read of all men.

(4)—WORSHIP.

In the Old Testament, and especially in the New, prominence is given to the institution of worship as a Divine requirement and a spiritual necessity. “Ye shall reverence My sanctuary,” we find among sundry laws given to the Children of Israel as representing the Church redeemed and journeying towards the great inheritance. And of the early Christians it is recorded that “they continued steadfastly in the Apostle’s doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” For such as have professed the name of Christ, to forsake the assembling of themselves together, is to cut themselves off from the goodly company of those who not only feel under a distinct obligation to frequent the House of Prayer, but whose spiritual life is quickened and maintained thereby. “We took sweet counsel together,” says the Psalmist, “and walked to the House of God in company.” And again, “I was glad when they said unto me, let us go into the House of the Lord.”

Besides those integral parts of worship—praise, reading of the Scriptures, prayer—in which each ought to take a devout and intelligent interest, there is the preaching of the word, which nothing can displace from its important and supreme position. “It does not answer the purpose,” says Jonathan Edwards, “which God had in instituting the office of preaching, merely for men to have good commentaries and expositions on the scriptures, and other good books of Divinity, because, though these may tend, as well as preaching, to give a good doctrinal or speculative understanding of the Word

of God, yet they have not an equal tendency to impress them on men's hearts and affections." *The soul's life begins to run in low and narrow channels as soon as the House of God is forsaken*, and the ears are closed to the voice of exhortation and appeal by which it has pleased God in all time to save them that believe.

(5) THE SACRAMENTS.

Superseding and taking the place of circumcision and the Passover, we have the Sacraments of the New Dispensation—Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. These derive their validity and authority from Christ Himself (Matthew xxviii. 19; Luke xxii. 19); and for any church, or any individual to neglect the plain command is to fail in obedience to the one Master, and to rob themselves of a designed benefit. There is a great difference between the *sacramentarian* and the *evangelical* use of these ordinances; and because certain attach a superstitious and wholly unwarrantable importance to them there should be no tendency to gravitate to the opposite extreme, and ignore them altogether. "By the blessing of Christ and the working of His Spirit in them that by faith receive them," the sacraments become channels of Divine Grace, and in the case of the Supper—a feast of recurring obligation—there is an ever fresh experience of the love and bounty of the Great Institutor.

"Here, Oh my Lord, I see Thee face to face,
Here would I taste and handle things unseen,
Here grasp with firmer hand the Eternal Grace,
And all my weariness upon Thee lean."

The Protestant view of the Lord's Supper is clearly and succinctly stated by the Westminster Divines, "The worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith made partakers of His body and blood, with all His benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace."

(6)—THE LORD'S DAY.

There is one Institution which takes precedence in time over every other, and is a bulwark of all national and personal religion, viz. :—The Sabbath. It is the day which by the appointment and example of God Himself is to be preserved free from the encroachments of worldly interests, and which, by the Divine command and the Saviour's custom (Luke iv. 16), is to be devoted to the high concerns of God and the soul. It has been proved beyond dispute that rest is needful to recuperate the wasted energies of animal life, and in the infinite kindness of God, a seventh part of time has been assigned for that purpose, "in it thou shalt not do any work." And closely associated with this need there is the demand which man's higher nature makes for leisure to take its bearings, and to adjust the balance which mundane obsessions have displaced. If the soul's life is to be maintained and promoted, *the Sabbath must be jealously guarded from every temptation to fritter away its hours either in idleness or secular employments, while every opportunity should be eagerly sought for sacred fellowship and private meditation.* "O blessed day," wrote Wilberforce of anti-slavery fame, "which allows us a precious interval wherein to praise, to come out from the thickest of worldly concerns, and to give our lives up to Heaven and Spiritual objects." All who have tasted and seen that the Lord is good, and who have learned by experience the inestimable value of the Day set apart from all time, will echo these words. To them it returns as a breath from the hills of God, without which their spiritual life would be stifled and "ready to perish" through the pressure of business and other duties in the working week.

They would be more and more "in the Spirit on the Lord's Day," and say and sing of it :—

"Bright shadows of true rest, some shores of bliss,
Heaven once a week,
The next world's gladness prepossessed in this,
A day to seek
Eternity in time ; time's bower,
The narrow way,
Transplanted paradise ; God's walking hour,
The cool o' the day,
The creation's jubilee ; God's parle with dust,
Heaven here ; Man on these hills of myrrh, of flowers,
Angels descending ; the returns of trust,
A gleam of glory after six days' showers."

III. PRESENT POSITION

The Secession Church in its Modern Environment.

By the
Rev. Professor MORTON, D.D.,
Glasgow.

With such a history behind it and such a doctrine too, as have been herein previously sketched the United Original Secession Church, when viewed as a present living organisation, must necessarily have a character peculiarly its own.

Accordingly in modern terms we are :

	PAGES
A. Presbyterians - - - - -	91-92
The democratic principle.	
To be distinguished from	
(1) Prelacy.	
(2) Independency.	
B. Seceders - - - - -	92-93
Separated from the National Church.	
Conditions when the Secession will be unjustifiable.	
Attitude to other Churches.	
Necessity for unity.	
C. Witnesses - - - - -	93-94
To neglected truths.	
To the ideal of the Covenanted Reformation.	
Testifying; but in faith and hope and love.	

THE SECESSION CHURCH IN ITS MODERN ENVIRONMENT.

A.—Presbyterians.

We are children of the Presbyterian household, and so in the matter of Church government we are to be distinguished on the one side from *Prelacy*, and on the other side from *Independency*. We maintain that all authority in the Church comes from Christ, its living glorious Head, and is conveyed by Him to those who legitimately exercise it by the membership of the Church. It comes from Christ through the voice, through the free election of the Christian Church. This fundamental principle of democracy lies at the very foundation of our Presbyterian system. No one who has not this election of the Christian people behind him can lawfully exercise any authority in the Church. And they who are thus chosen and installed have an equality of position in the Church. They may be chosen and installed for a different type of service—some specially to teach, some specially to rule—but they occupy the same rank as far as official position is concerned. Different names are given to those put in this position—*bishops*, *presbyters*, *elders*, *pastors*—but in the New Testament these names do not indicate any superior rank assigned to one official and not to another. All are in an equality as far as office and position go. So we discard the idea of a gradation of official rank—rising from deacon through curate, vicar and bishop to archbishop and cardinal—as unscriptural, and as a development that finds its explanation not in the guidance of Christ by His Spirit, but in an attempt to conform the Church to the world. While on the one side we reject this lordly

Monarchy that is without any mandate from the Christian people, we maintain that in Christ's ideal of His Church the various units, found in individual congregations, are to be linked together by an external representative organisation, and an external organisation that not only builds them into a large unity, but exercises supervision and rule over them. The elders of a local congregation are represented in a Presbytery, the members of a Presbytery are represented in a district Synod, and the different district Synods are represented in a General Assembly, that, if rightly constituted, will echo the voice of the Christian people of any nation. In insisting on this we oppose Independence—that leaves the units without any official link binding them together.

B.—Seceders.

The term "Secession," which is prominent in the name by which our section of the Christian Church in Scotland is known, holds within it our attitude to other sections into which, unhappily, that Church has become divided. We are Seceders, having separated ourselves from the courts of the National Church, because freedom to bear testimony against evil that had crept into it was denied. Having thus separated, the wise resolution was made not to come under the jurisdiction of these courts until these evils were effectively dealt with. There was no intention to set up a rival Church, and indeed, the name Church was carefully avoided. We are a part—it may be even a fragment—of the National Church, separated from its courts, *because in this separation our loyalty to the great Head of the Church can alone find adequate expression.* Could this loyalty to Christ, to His claims as the only Head of the Church, and the Head of nations, be out and out maintained in reunion with these courts, our separation would no longer be justified. It is not simply our individual personal loyalty that must

be conserved, but our loyalty as a company banded together to witness to truths that have not received due recognition, and to work towards winning that recognition.

Our attitude towards other ecclesiastical organisations in Scotland that are directly or indirectly off-shoots from the Protestant Presbyterian Church, set up in Reformation times, is one of frank open recognition of them as branches of the Church of Christ. With this recognition there is a longing that the things that hinder them coming together in a united testimony to Christ's claims, and in united action for the furtherance of His Kingdom may be removed. We are under solemn obligation by our very position and history *to strive after making visible the unity of believers* in their being banded together in one outward organisation, and especially thus making visible the unity of Presbyterians. And while this visible unity tarries, we can and ought to stretch brotherly hands over the dividing barriers and unite, as far as consistent with loyalty to Christ, in common effort for the advancement of the Divine Kingdom. While thus recognising other sections of the divided Church of Scotland as branches of the one Church of Christ we must justify our separation from them by maintaining our protest against the evils found in them, that remain sufficient justification for remaining separate. If it is to be in any way effective it must be a protest not in word only but in practice. We must keep aloof as an organisation from those deviations from the way of Christ revealed in His word, that have been, to our grief and to the hurt of Christ's interests in the land, the cause of separation.

C.—Witnesses.

We are thus a witnessing company, organised to bear witness to truths that have been and are neglected, not only by the rulers of the Church, but by the rulers of the nation. *We stand up for an ideal*

of the Church and of the nation in which the supremacy of Jesus will be vindicated and acknowledged. It is the ideal that lies behind the Covenanted Reformation, and regarding which one has finely said "I think that no worthy historian has yet been found to tell, as it ought to be told, how much Scotland owes to the splendid vision which these men (the Covenanters) sought—the vision of a consecrated land of saints, ruled over by a Covenanted King, loyal to Christ. It hovered before the rapt eyes of these Saints of Scotland until it well-nigh turned them into seers, it elevated them until it made them heroes, and though the picture seemed to fade away before the eyes of their children as though it was painted by the morning light on the mist of their own mountains, still it has done its work, for it has contributed mightily to mould the hearts of Scotsmen. But has it so faded? Or is it not simply thrown forward, as the old Jew learned to throw his Messianic hopes forward from one false anticipated Christ to another, better and greater yet to come? When the King comes—the true King of the Covenant—then we may look for the Kingdom! and we shall have then the Covenant in its essence, and the realm of the Bride and the Lamb and the glory of a Holy Church in a Holy Land." (Dr Oswald Dykes.) Our attitude is that of waiting for the realisation of the ideal and waiting in the dependence of faith upon the exalted Saviour by whose interposition—by whose coming—the realisation will be effected.

INDEX.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Act Recissory	15
Aitken, Rev. J.	42
Anderson, Rev. J.	41, 42, 43
Anti-Burghers	23, 26
Argyle	15
Assembly, 1638	12
Associate Presbytery	17, 21
Associate Synod of North America	48
Benevolence of Jesus	68
Bible	59, 84
Bishops	10
Blakely, Dr	43
Black Acts	11
Breach, The	23
Bristo Street Church	27
Burghers	23, 26
Burgess Oath	22, 32
Cameronians	16
Candlish, Dr	30, 38
Character of Jesus	68
Christian, The	79
Covenant, National	10, 12, 40
Covenanters	15
Covenanting	33, 45
Confession of Faith	25
Craig, John	10
Creation	54
Cromwell	13
Cross of Jesus	70
Disruption, 1843	37
Divinity Hall	43

	PAGE
Election	59
Erskine, Ebenezer	17, 22
Fathers, the Four	17, 21
Fatherhood	60
Free Church	37, 38, 41, 48
Gairney Bridge	21
General Associate Synod	23
Gib, Adam	23
Gospel	72, 74
Guthrie, Dr	38
Henderson, Rev. Alexander	12
Holy Spirit	82
Humility of Jesus	69
Irish Secession Synod	45, 48
Immanence of God	57
King's Confession	10
Knox, John	9, 10
Lights, Old and New	23, 24, 26
Lord's Day	87
Love of Jesus	69
Magistrate	25
Magazine, O.S.	39, 40, 44
Man, Creation of	55
Manson, Dr	40
Melville, Andrew	10
Middle on's Drunken Parliament	14
Mission, Home	46
Mission, Foreign	46
Miracles	56
Moncrieff Alexander	17, 23
Morton, Regent	10
Morton, Professor	44
Murray, Professor	40
M'Crie, Dr	29, 40
M'Neel, Rev. J.	47

	PAGE
Paxton, Dr	28, 30
Person	54
Popery	10
Prayer	83
Presbyterianism	13, 91
Protestantism	9, 10, 16
Protestors, Synod of	28
Providence	56
Queen Mary	10
Redemption	58
Reformed Presbyterian Church	49
Regeneration	59
Religion	61
Renwick	15
Resurrection of Jesus	71
Revolution Settlement	16
Sacraments	86
Service Book	11, 12
Sin	58
Sinlessness of Jesus	68
Smellie, Dr	49
Son of God	65
Son of Man	67
Spence, Professor	43
Stevenson, Dr	28, 29
Sturrock, Rev. D. A.	43
Superintendents	10
Transcendence of God	53
Trinity	54
Unity of Believers	93
William of Orange	15
Witnesses	93
Worship	85

Original Secession Magazine

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

Editor - Rev. Robert Hobart, M.A., Perth.
Treasurer Mr Thos. Matthew, Solicitor, Kilwinning

Price 7s. per annum, post free
Single copies - 7d., post free.

The United States of America,
two dollars per annum, post free

Original Secession Testimony

9d. per copy.

Rules and Forms of Ecclesiastical Procedure

4d. per copy.

From the Synod Treasurer—

Mr JOHN KYLE,
15 Orchard Park, Giffnock, Glasgow.



History and doctrine of the Unit
Secession Church of Scotland /
Francis Davidson. -- Edinburgh
[1923?]
99p. ; 17cm.

1. United Original Secession C
Scotland--Addresses, essays, lec
United Original Secession Church
II. Davidson, Francis.

